Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. SEPTEMBER 1928.

THE EVANGELICAL SYNOD AND CHURCH UNION*

By Professor C. E. Schneider

1. The Church of Christ Is the Organism in Which Christ's Spirit Resides and Effects a Unity Between All Its Members

Any consideration of Church union, whether it involves the union of numerous denominations or merely the merging of a few must make the distinction between the spiritual invisible organism of the Church and the physical, visible organization into denominational forms.

Primarily Jesus did not found an external institution. Jesus dealt more in principles than in precise programs. Throughout his ministry he pronounced the message and cared little for the mechanics. That, around which modern denominations revolve and seek their right of existence—doctrine, organization, worship—was of little significance for Jesus. Certainly Jesus did not require creedal subscription or a finished theology in order to enter into the Kingdom of God. Nor did Jesus demand that members of the Church assume a definite form of external organization among themselves. He rather emphasized that the relations of the members to each other be on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount. Members of the Kingdom are not to be as deacons, elders or bishops but as little children.

* This paper was read at the last conference of the Missouri District and is published at the request of said district.

And thus, in all this, the Church of Christ is primarily revealed as a qualitative entity. Beneath the historical, quantitative present-day sociological structure we perceive the qualitative functioning of free individuals constituting a spiritual unity by the binding power of an inner organizing energy. A reference to merely historical data for the explanation of the nature and the function of the Church is inadequate. We are confronted in the Church with a mystery the solution of which lies quite beyond any rationalization on our part. It is a spiritual mystery as marriage itself and it is not surprising, therefore, that Paul should speak of the Church as the Bride of Christ. Again he refers to it as the Body of Christ, the Heavenly City, the New Jerusalem, the Communion of Saints. The Church which Christ founded "was a family, with God as a common Father, its bond of union was that of a spiritual kinship, cemented by an affection, where obedience was obtained by personal and fraternal admonitions, counsel and persuasion. Its membership were 'brethren', 'sons of God', 'children of God', and they constituted 'the household of faith.' "[1]

In this sense the Church is a spiritual organism in which, by the common faith of its members, all believers, regardless of denominational affiliation, are bound together in the invisible Church through the bond of the Spirit. Although such a unity is invisible yet from the very beginning the Christians testified to their experience of "the holy catholic Church", and even as more definitely in the Nicene Creed we read "I believe in *one* holy catholic and apostolic Church." Jesus in his prayer that all may be one, certainly had in mind first of all this vital unity in the Spirit based on a common love and loyalty and purpose.

This has been the tacit position of Lutheran groups to the question of church union. Here, where the emphasis was placed on the faith-life of the individual which binds all believers together into the invisible Church, the whole question of church union becomes an anomaly for according to this view, "the united church already exists".[2] And indeed, the Lutheran position needs to be properly appreciated. There is such a thing as the invisible Church of the believers. Perhaps the outstanding Lutheran contribution to the religious life of the day consists in emphasizing the world of spiritual values which Luther summed up in the word "Faith" in the sense of "trust" or "fiducia". From this viewpoint the German scholar Sohm made an incisive indictment of the institutionalization of the Church, devoting his scholarly work on "Kirchenrecht" to the thesis that church law and church organization are inherently

---

[1] Sims, What must the Church do to be Saved? p. 117.
[2] Brent (Editor), Can the churches unite? p. 193.

opposed to the essential nature of the Church. The Church of Christ represents the organism in which his Spirit resides and effects a unity between all its members. The genius of the Church lies in the nature of its spiritual organism and not in any attainment or efficiency of secular organization.

II. Deominations Are the Historical Expression of This Spiritual Organism of the Body of Christ Endeavoring to Meet the Particular Needs of Peculiar Situations

It is impossible, however, to remain standing on this proposition. An advance, or rather as some may claim, a retreat has taken place from the lofty position occupied by Jesus in the founding of his Church. The Church, beginning under the impetus of the staggering, spiritual personality of Jesus, when the immediacy of that spiritual presence disappeared, began to assume organizational forms. Denominational bodies were called into existence by the need to meet altered historical situations. We are confronted by the fact that the "idea" with which we begin wears off into an organization.

Such a process of development is not at all unique. It is the common experience in historical growth. The "idea" always comes first. The history of the world and of the church tells the romantic story of how sociological formations are the product of mental images and spiritual ideas. The question of whether it was inevitable that the "idea" of Jesus should materialize into a visible church and become institutionalized has been variously argued. Indeed it seems to lie in the logical course of sociological developments that individuals, imbued with the same loyalties and the same driving ideas, will inevitably band themselves into corporate groups in order the better to express themselves and propagate their ideas.

Already in the life time of Jesus the diversity of interpretation begins. The Apostolic church was denominationally divided into Gentile and Jewish Christians, the Corinthian church was divided into theological factions identifying themselves with their selected leaders Paul or Appollos or Cephas or Christ.[3] Similar divisions continued throughout the Middle Ages, strenuously combated by the Roman Church, but by their very existence testifying to the flexibility and plasticity of the Christian idea.

It is an unreasoned procedure, from our modern point of view, in *a priori* fashion to condemn the rise of denominations. We may see something beautiful in the spectacle of the seed of the Kingdom shooting forth into many denominational branches. A strong historical defense may be urged for the rise of denominations. The

[3] (1 Cor. 1: 12)

freedom of the children of God is not to be curbed by artificial boundaries but is assured by the possibility of unfettered historical development.

The origins of the great denominations of today are not to be traced to foolish eccentricities of strangely-minded and half-souled man. They are rather the products of burning religious fires in the hearts of spiritually minded men who were strong enough to transcend the bound of tradition and convention and to step forth into a realm of the new and hitherto unexplored. Sometimes they met with rebuff and persecution. The little group at Scrooby, England which took its heroic stand against the popery of the Established Church was forced to leave the homeland and finally landing at Plymouth became the forerunners of American Congregationalism. Fourteen miles from Scrooby, in the town of Epworth, was born John Wesley, who, in an age when the church had become institutionalized, morally decadent and spiritually cold was destined to inaugurate a worldwide movement which recognized anew the power of Christianity as an internal force, manifesting itself in holiness of life and the immediate presence of the Spirit. Thus Methodism was born. In a day when liberty of conscience was suppressed, when state and church exerted unwarranted authority over individuals the Baptist principles of religious liberty, regenerate church membership and believers' baptism sprang into existence. In the early part of the 19th century when Reformed and Lutherans were viciously opposing each other in Germany the time was fulfilled for Frederick William III, to attempt to unite the two contending groups into what became known as the Church of the Evangelical Union. And when in the year 1840 a group of German Evangelical pastors, accidentally as it were, discovered themselves engaged in the similar task of ministering to the needs of the spiritually destitute German immigrants on the Missouri frontier, what more expedient step could they take than to band themselves together for the better performance of these tasks! And there resulted from this meeting in the little log-house parsonage at Gravois Settlement Missouri, on October 15th, 1840 "Kirchen-Verein des Westens"—later to develop into the Evangelical Synod of America.

We are tempted to lament the existence of many denominations. Yet such diversity in itself need not destroy the unity of the spirit. Existing side by side, they represent sincere and honest attempts to give expression to spiritual values which historically it has been their lot to receive, and which in a rather accidental manner in each case has taken on its own individual forms. Indeed it is just the unity of the spirit which tolerates and welcomes such a diversity for it honors the head, which is Christ.

III. The Unity of the Church of Christ Becomes Lost When Churches Insist on Retaining Their Denominational Forms When the Spiritual Need Therefor No Longer Exists

We have just maintained that denominations as such need not be considered an evil for they may testify to the working of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men. The shame of Protestantism does not lie in the diversity of its denominational forms. These are the product of the free historical development which is the genius of Protestantism. Such diversity may not be essentially incompatible with the spirit which binds all together. Indeed for the attainment of the unity of the fold it is not necessary to effect a uniformity of organization. There was less real unity of the spirit in the imposing unified structure of the medieval Catholic Church than may be found among smaller denominational bodies of our day who by some peculiar quirk of history are carrying on their separate existences perhaps unknown to each other.

And yet, although denominations may be the product of the Spirit, it is possible for them to develop in such a manner as to disturb the unity of the Church of Christ. Although the spiritual needs which called many of our denominations into existence no longer prevail, these selfsame denominations, riding on the high tide of the momentum of their glorious past and revered traditions, continue to nurture their ancient historical forms. Loyalty to the denomination is confused with loyalty to Christ. Is there a spiritual need for the Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists to continue their north and south division on an issue which was settled more than 50 years ago? We are told that, "In one of the smaller cities of the Atlantic coast stand two Presbyterian churches facing each other, upon opposite sides of the street. They are the result of a division that occurred in one of them almost two generations ago because a portion of the congregation held to a 'mediate atonement' and the other to an 'immediate atonement,' distinctions which few Christians today would understand without recourse to a theological dictionary. At the beginning of the 18th century the Baptists of Delaware withdrew from fellowship with the Baptists of Philadelphia because the latter did not 'hold to the laying on of hands.' "[4] Or is there any valid justification for some Presbyterians of today to divide on the question of whether hymns *and* psalms should be sung or only psalms.

The long continued denominational inbreeding process tends to establish denominational loyalties apart from spiritual motives and values. All too frequently a kind of denominational chauvin-

---

[4] *Ashworth*, The Unicorn of Christian Forces (p. 68)

ism develops which frequently becomes obnoxiously manifest in others long before we discern it in ourselves. Ashworth suggests that the lukewarmness and indifference toward the whole subject of church union is frequently caused by the "fear of denominational sheriffs and editors and officials who are constantly occupied in keeping the denominational fences in repair."[5] Thus it has come to such a ludicrous pass that, "Neither Presbyterians, Methodists nor Baptists could ordain Martin Luther to the ministry if he were living. He could not so much as be made an elder or deacon in the Presbyterian church. And yet he is the father of Protestantism. Carey, Wesley, Spurgeon and hosts of the best ministers the world ever had, could find a place in but few of our denominations."[6] Alexander Campbell one of the earliest exponents of church unity in America should have said: "This plan of making our own nests and fluttering over our own brood; of building our own tents and of confining all goodness and grace to our noble selves and to the elect few who are like us, is the quintessence of sublimated Pharisaism. . . . To lock ourselves up in the bandbox of our own circle, to associate with a few units, tens or hundreds, as the pure church, as the elect, is real Protestant monkery—is evangelical Pharisaism."[7]

Indeed such an attitude is more than Pharisaism it is schismatic. Any Church which by its spiritual ministry does not at the same time challenge the validity of its purely temporal existence and is not willing to sacrifice its traditions and deny itself for the sake of the Kingdom of God and the greater unity of the invisible Church of which it is a part, any such church is, spiritually speaking, schismatic for it has fallen away from the ideals of the spiritual organism, the unity of which only theoretically or sentimentally it professes. "What right," asks Merrill, "has a 'denomination' to exist? Only as a serious attempt to realize the universal church of Christ. For any branch of the Church to hold as essential anything it does not consider essential to the universal church is a crime. It is in subordination toward Jesus Christ, the One Great Head of the Church."[8] This is the denominational schism of standing apart from the unity of the "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all who is over all, and through all, and in all."[9] Such considerations as these, perhaps, led Bishop Anderson of Chicago to claim that in order to create the atmosphere in which unity shall thrive, "we must first confess the sin of schism—the sin, I

---

[5] *Ashworth*, Ibid (p. 65)
[6] Sims, Ibid p. 97.
[7] Brent, Ibid p. 15.
[8] Brent, Ibid p. 40.
[9] Eph. 4: 5.

say, not simply its economic disadvantage, its short-sighted policy, its unstatesmanlike methods, its unstrategic warfare with the world, but its sin."[10]

And so we repeat, the shame of Protestantism lies not in the diversity of its varied denominational forms, but in the reluctance to surrender these forms for the sake of the transcending spiritual values of the Church Universal.

It may be a comparatively simple matter to accept the principles discussed above. It is immeasurably more difficult to commit ourselves to some of the correlaries, especially if we should apply the principles to our own denomination. What attitude ought our denomination take with regard to church union? As is frequently the case in other matters, the theory of church union is far in advance of the reality. We may accept the theory in the abstract but find ourselves confronted by innumerable prejudices and seemingly insuperable difficulties when we begin to consider possible ways of procedure. Perhaps we find ourselves in the plight of Charles Lamb who, when asked by a friend if he was musical, replied "Sentimentally I am disposed to harmony, but organically I am incapable of a tune." We are all theoretically disposed to harmony. Just how incapable are we of a tune? Bearing in mind the distinction between the concepts of unity and union we may at least attempt to express our position in the form of several principles bearing respectively on these two points.

IV. The Evangelical Synod, True to the Ideals Which It Professes as a Member of the Body of Christ, in the Light of Its Historical Origin and Subsequent Development, Is Commited to the Principle of Church Unity

First of all then the Evangelical Synod is in accord with the principle of Church Unity. We are a church which is full of the unity spirit. It is significant that as a motto we accept the Ephesian statement "giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."[11] The origin of our Synod is not found in any factional division within a previously existing body from which we split off. We do not represent a divergence from another church. Rather, in the light of our European background, we came into existence through the effort to unite two already diverging bodies whose organizational forms were at variance with each other. This merging was proposed on the assumption that the existing spiritual unity justified such a union. The Union Church of Germany, called

---

[10] Brent, Ibid 212.
[11] Eph. 4: 3.

into existence in 1817 to bridge the yawning gap between the Reformed and Lutheran branches, was designed to comprehend the strengths of each and to assure liberty to both branches. There was not to be even so much as uniformness in doctrines and organization. The emphasis was placed upon the inner unity of the spirit which was thought to obtain between churches so organically akin to each other. In this respect we are a *unity* church perhaps more than a union church and therefore the ideals of spiritual unity should be close to our hearts and understanding. Indeed ours is not the problem of effecting a *return* or a *reunion* to some body from which we separated many years ago. Rather we were born under the auspices of the "will to unity" which, if truly genuine, will of innate necessity lead beyond the mere theory to visible expression.

Again, if we consider the American origin of our church in 1840 we shall find the same unmistakable evidence of the "will to unity." In the early decades of the 19th century German immigrants began to flood into the Mississippi Valley, colonizing in St. Louis and vicinity. Here were accumulated Germans of all classes and of all religious and irreligious complexions. It soon became evident that they were wantonly spiritually destitute. Who would care for their needs? To make short a long though exceedingly interesting story we find a number of German pastors, we know them by name and from memory, Nollau of Barmen, Riess, Gerber, Wall and Rieger of Basel, Heyer of the Rhein Society, Garlichs and Daubert ministering to these people mainly under the auspices of the Basel and Barmen mission societies. Accidentally, as it were, they discovered each other in their common task and organized into a society of pastors devoted to the cause of building the Kingdom of God. They were not interested in the founding of a new denomination but were led by the unity of their common spiritual interests to band themselves toegther. They believed more in making Christians than in persuading people to become members of the "Kirchenverein." They were Kingdom-minded men and had nothing of the furor of denominationalism. Their's was an irenic spirit, manifested in long continued relations with other church bodies. Fraternal delegates were exchanged at conferences with Presbyterians and other Eastern synods. We know particularly of the presence of a Rev. David Dimond of the Presbyterian Synod of Missouri at the Holstein Conference of 1850, and of his commendatory remarks concerning German theological learning. We recall how the Marthasville Seminary was supported by members of other denominations. Gifts were received from "Yankee" men and women such as from Mrs. Webb's Infant Sabbath School," and a Mr. Van Buren, a Mr. Urben, Mr. Scarrit. Particularly do we think of the relations

maintained with Christian friends of the East, the Mr. R. Biglow of Hartford, Connecticut and the "Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education in the West," which supported our struggling Seminary at Marthasville with notable gifts of money.

The genius for unity existing in the early days of our church is plainly evident. Our church fathers stood on a platform large enough to accommodate all denominations so long as they were interested in building the Kingdom of God in the spirit of Jesus the Christ. It is hazardous to argue against church union by reference to the traditions of our past and by claiming that to effect a closer union with some other church body would be contrary to the spirit of the founders of our church. Perhaps our eyes would be opened if we could interview some of these selfsame church fathers and have them tell us that they were never interested in the continued existence of the "Kirchen-verein" to the extent that a rapproachment with other bodies should be avoided. These men could join hands with men of diverse convictions. The Augustinian phrase was more than a mere abstraction to them. They themselves breathed the spirit of "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas." Indeed here, we find the noblest heritage which has come down to us from a glorious past. And being true to that tradition, we find ourselves committed to the principle of unity.

V. The Evangelical Synod Committed to the Principle of Church Unity, Must Seriously Consider How the Logical and Spiritual Consummation of This Principle May Affect Its Independent Denominational Existence

In considering this proposition we may first of all raise the question of whether in last years and decades we have remained true to the best unity traditions, or whether we have not trended toward a denominationalism which does violence to this heritage of ours. So long as we were content to nurture unity ideals and labor for Kingdom causes, questions of doctrinal position and organization were shifted into the background.

However, as we grew larger in numbers and as we came to rub up against other closely organized denominations we were inevitably forced to answer such questions as, "Who are you?" "Why do you exist?" What do you want?" "Where do you stand?" "Where are you going?" We were forced to probe into the question as to whether our church had outlived its right of existence. The German immigrant had ceased to come. Increasingly it became apparent that the reasons which underlay our origin would not longer sanction our present existence. Conditions of a new day seemed to require that we build new foundations. The literally

spiritual position which in times past was our pride has recently come to be regarded as a liability. What we need today, some would claim, is a closely knitted creedal statement so that every one may know where we stand and on the basis of which it would be possible to conduct an intelligent promotional campaign, inspire loyalties and devotion and grow larger and stronger.

The same line of argument is followed in the field of organization. We are witnessing a development in our church which is moving from the spiritual basis to that of physical organization and which may involve the surrender of a spiritual principle for an organizational advance. Certainly we sense the danger of it. The very fact that recently under the auspices of the "Forward Movement" and through other channels a vigorous effort was made to place spiritual things first through the organization of committees for the deepening of spiritual life—I say this very fact showed that we sensed the danger lying in the trend toward organization and made attempts to overcome it.

However, in the light of our past we seem essentially to be more of a movement than an organization. As a movement we are seemingly in danger of being submerged by other more highly organized church bodies. In self defense we have at times quite deliberately resorted to expansion programs and Forward movements. The "will to unity" which is indifferent to organizational niceties is capitulating to the "will to organize." With pride we consider our accomplishments, the New Eden, Foreign Missions, Home Mission, etc. In past years there have been sporadic demonstrations of brilliance so that other denominations seem to have sat up and taken notice. The vision rises in the minds of some of us that the future of our church is glorious with the promise of becoming a large and influential denomination which may take an honorable place in the councils of American Church bodies.

And yet, the virile strength of our church does not lie in this direction. The most distinctive thing about us is that we have no distinctive organizational or doctrinal features and that our strength lies in just that spiritual point of view which gave us birth as the Union Church in Germany and as the non-sectarian, interdenominationally minded "Kirchen-Verein des Westens" in 1840. We are so committed to the Spirit of Unity that we can best save our souls not by deflecting into the byways of denominationalism but by seriously endeavoring to follow through to the logical and spiritual consummation of these Kingdom principles, regardless of whither they may lead, and however they may affect our continued independent denominational existence.

Are we strong enough to draw the final conclusions? Surely

we are agreed at least to the principle that the only justification for our denominational existence is the unsullied committal to the spiritual ideals of the Kingdom of God. The more this ideal is attained the less important does the continuance of our denominational existence become. We find ourselves confronted by the paradox which is the paradox of all spiritual values—that by the losing of life we gain it.

We have dealt with this subject rather abstractly from the point of view of principles. To visualize what we have in mind let us suppose that somewhere in the United States there existed a denomination which from almost every point of view is akin to us. Historically its roots run back into Germany and its pastors and members came from practically the same sections as ours and possess the same general racial memories having immigrated to this country under the same general conditions. In organization they may differ and in doctrinal standards they may not be identical but in their spiritual temper and religious zeal, in their theological trends and ethical ideals they coincide with us. Here we may find a type of preacher and congregation which represents the best of our hopes and expectations. In other words, we here discover a spiritual brother. Would it not be a tragedy if somewhere in the United States such a church should exist and continue to exist apart from any closer fraternal relations with us!

This is largely a hypothetical case. There are some who may say that such a church is found in the United Brethren, others will say it is a Lutheran church, others the Reformed. And indeed we need not immediately press the argument to fit the concrete case. First let us clear our minds with regard to the principle involved. Being committed to the principle of church unity we must seriously consider how the logical and spiritual consummation of this principle may lead to important readjustments in our denominational affairs, and may eventually require the dissolution of our present denominational forms.

This may not require merging to the extent that we dissolve or annihilate ourselves. Unity leads inevitably to union but it does not require uniformity. The unity of the fold is not discernable in the uniform sameness of the individual sheep, for physically they differ much from each other. The unity of the fold lies in the attitude toward the shepherd. May we not live in the hope that somewhere and sometime we may find a kindred group with whom we are so compatible that creedal distinctions become unimportant in view of the great spiritual concensus which unites. It is safe to suppose that any plan of union which may eventually be proposed which may bring us into closer relations with some de-

nominational affinity, can never be founded on the basis of uniformity. Unity in variety and diversity must prevail. By analogy we think of the union which is found in the orchestra where it is not required that all instruments be alike. Indeed they must be distinctive and yet together effect a unison.

Such a unison based on love, and affection cannot be effected by blueprint methods but will develop spontaneously as we permit the Spirit of Jesus to become operative in our lives. As someone has said: "We do not want unity by machinery any more than we want truth by machinery or prayers by machinery."[12] Church Union will then result not so much from our acts nor will it be an act. It will rather manifest itself in the functioning of the Church and Churches and proceed from within—out. Without affection there can be no happy, lasting marriage. Love, the essence of religion, will alone be the basis of Church Union.

There is a legend in the Talmud of two brothers who owned in common a field upon the site of which King Solomon later built the first Temple at Jerusalem. One night, so the story runs, the younger of the brothers said, "My brother has a wife and children to support while I have no one to care for but myself. I will go into the harvest field and take some of the sheaves of grain that fall to me and put them with my brother's sheaves without his knowledge, that he may have sufficient to provide for those he loves." On the same night the other brother thought, "God has blessed me with wife and children, while my brother lives alone. I will arise and take of my shocks of grain and lay them with my brother's share that he may be comforted in his loneliness." Thus, in the morning, to their surprise, each found his share undiminished. The next night each repeated his kind deed and with the same result. On the third night both brothers determined to watch, and, to their mutual surprise, they met in the middle of the field, each laden with his golden sheaves. And God said of the spot where they embraced, 'This is the holiest spot I know: here I will build my holy Temple.'[13] May the day soon come when denominations will thus discover themselves.

What should we do about it? A union with the Reformed Church is now being espoused in some circles. Meditate upon it and think it through as best we can. We all desire more information and without more knowledge our sentiment and feelings are apt to run riot. Certainly let no preconceived ideas prejudice us before we become better acquainted with what may be involved.

---

[12] Brent, Ibid p. 168.

[13] Quoted by Ashworth, Ibid p. 98.

Church union is not a manufactured product nor is it to be attained by a program of doctrine or organization. Church union is usually the consummation of a long period of development marked by various stages. Again the Talmud says "Walking on the mountain one day I saw a form which I took to be a beast; coming nearer I saw it was a man, approaching nearer still I found it was my brother." Let us take some definite and active steps whereby we may come nearer to and better understand the genius of the Reformed church. Now from the distance there may be nothing attractive in this vision, perhaps next year some of the objections may be removed and perhaps in the years and years to come gradually, step by step we may learn to so know and appreciate each other that our final verdict may be "This is my brother."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES FOR THE MODERN MINISTRY

By Professor Phil. Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D

(Concluded)

What Are the Churches Doing towards the Training of Their Ministers in the Social Sciences?

If the social sciences are so important for the work of the Christian minister, the next question is, what are the various American denominations doing to equip their leaders with this valuable weapon? The answer is encouraging. The religious organizations of our country have lagged a generation behind the churches of the older nations of Europe in this respect, but they are now catching up with vigor. The social gospel is fast becoming orthodox. Lectures and discussions on social subjects are becoming increasingly popular at synods, conferences, pastor's clubs and clerical summer schools of all descriptions and have always been so with theological students. An immense and ever growing social literature tends to enlighten and inspire many ministers. The social interest in the Church has now run beyond the stage of a solitary pioneer. It has been admitted within the organization of the Church.

The Social Commissions

Probably the most important agency for keeping the ministers and the church members as well as the general public abreast of the times has been the appointment and maintenance under various names of commissions on Christianity and social problems by all individual denominations, supplemented by a similar committee of the Federation of the Churches of Christ in America, and the international commission on social research of the Stockholm World Conference on life and work. The Roman Catholic Church and the Council of Jewish Rabbis have joined this procession of social progress making the religious forces of America a unit on this point. At critical times the leaders of these three national commissions work together.

These social commissions have no political or economic program. They only seek to use all available opportunities for the study of social and economic conditions and problems in order to assist their respective denominations to make a definite contribution to the social thought and progress of America which is in full harmony with the spirit and the principles of each Church. To this end the task of these Commissions is usually fourfold:

(1) To gather complete, accurate and unprejudiced information concerning economic conditions in this country and in other lands, and concerning all events or movements which involve moral principles or have a bearing upon the welfare of the people.

(2) To study this information in the light of the spirit and the letter of the teachings of Christ and with a view to discover what needs to be done to relieve and remove social wrongs and to Christianize the present social order.

(3) To keep in touch with respective commissions of the Federal Council and similar groups in other denominations, as well as with any other Christian agencies aiming at improving and promoting the welfare of the people.

(4) To keep the people in our churches informed concerning the above and kindred subjects through timely popular articles and discussions in our periodicals and otherwise.

In its efforts to realize these objects, the social commissions usually work along three lines: education, organization, and field activities.

(1) The educational work includes (a) careful studies of the social situation in America and throughout the world by its officers and members; (b) the publication of the results of such studies for the use of our pastors and people in our church and Sunday school periodicals and in occasional bulletins and leaflets; (c) special research work as to conditions in American industries, (d) the recommendation of suitable books and periodicals for general reading, (e) such co-operation with the different boards, activities and agencies of each denomination as may be in line with the commission's task.

(2) As to organization the Commissions aim to encourage the appointment of committees on social service and education in our congregations and in regional and district conferences as well as co-operation with local and national movements which aim at the prevention or the relief of wrong social conditions.

(3) The field activities of the Commission embrace sermons, lectures, Bible studies and addresses throughout the year by members of the commission at synods, general, district and pastoral conferences, Brotherhoods, Women's Unions, and at other occasions; also individual conferences and private correspondence.

The Social Creed of the Churches

As a crowning demonstration of the social awakening in the churches comes the fact that the new social convictions have come near to getting lodgment in a creed, as in every formative age the church has felt the need of defining its orthodoxy in formal statements of belief. The honor of making the first ringing social declaration belongs to the Methodist Church North, in 1908, and was soon followed by other denominations. Throughout the last twenty years these bodies have continued to express themselves concerning the social question in expository and expanded statements. In this they have been joined by the liberal wing of the Roman Catholic Church which had a long historic tradition behind it, culminating in the famous encyclical of Leo XIII. The full voice of American religion was uttered in concert when the council of rabbis began to fulfil the law and the prophets through its commission on social justice. An examination of these respective utterances reveals a significant unanimity of judgment concerning the main points at issue.

"The social ideals of the churches," were adopted as a social platform by the first quadrennial of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in Chicago 1912, ratified by the second quadrennial in St. Louis 1916; reaffirmed by the Cleveland Conference, May 6-8, 1919 and were adopted by most of the Protestant denominations. As these principles should never fall into "innocuous desuetude, we reprint them here.

The churches stand for:

1. Equal rights and justice for all men in all stations of life.

2. Protection of the family by the single standard of purity, uniform divorce laws, proper regulation of marriage, proper housing.

3. The fullest possible development of every child, especially by the provision of education and recreation.

4. Abolition of child labor.

5. Such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

6. Abatement and prevention of poverty.

7. Protection of the individual and society from the social economic and moral waste of the liquor traffic.

8. Conservation of health.

9. Protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational diseases and mortality.

10. The right of all men to the opportunity for self maintenance, for safeguarding this right against encroachments of every kind, for the protection of workers from the hardships of enforced unemployment.

11. Suitable provision for the old age of the workers, and for those incapacitated by injury.

12. The right of employees and employers alike to organize, and for adequate means of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes.

13. Release from employment one day in seven.

14. Gradual and reasonable reduction of hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

15. A living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

16. A new emphasis upon the application of Christian principles to the acquisition and use of property, and for the most equitable division of the product of industry that can ultimately be devised.

Facing the social issues which have developed since the war, be it resolved: That we affirm as Christian Churches:

1. That the teachings of Jesus are those of essential democracy and express themselves through brotherhood and the cooperation of all groups. We deplore class struggle and declare against all class domination, whether of capital or labor. Sympathizing with labor's desire for a better pay and an equitable share in the profits and management of industry, we stand for orderly and progressive social reconstruction instead of revolution by violence.

2. That an ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy, and that collective bargaining and the sharing of shop control and management are inevitable steps in its attainment.

3. That the first charge upon industry should be that of a wage

sufficient to support an American standard of living. To that end we advocate the guarantee of a minimum wage, the control of unemployment through government labor exchanges, public works, land settlement, social insurance and experimentation in profit sharing and cooperative ownership.

4. We believe that women should have full political and economic equality with equal pay for equal work, and a maximum eight hour day. We declare for the abolition of night work by women, and the abolition of child labor; and for the provision of adequate safeguards to insure the moral as well as the physical health of the mothers and children of the race.

Of course this "Creed" possesses no ecclesiastical authority, in the sense that it has behind it no pains or penalties. It has, however, considerable moral force and educational power. Therefore it is creative and directive. It indicates the direction in which religion is both leading and pushing public opinion and action. So to call the original statement a social creed was not altogether to use a metaphor. It set down some things which the churches stand or must stand for, that is some standards which the churches believe ought to be reached and which they propose to try to get translated into action. This is certainly a primary function of faith. Thus is an ethical religion realized. Also this statement partakes of the nature of a creed in that most of the rank and file of the churches and quite a few of the clergy, either do not know that it exists, care little or nothing about it, or make no effort to put it into life.

When those who wrote the social creed, under the impulse of a long religious tradition, mentioned some of the things that the labor and farm leaders and also the socialists had been striving for, and when later the social workers and the progressives repeated in substance the main things that all the rest had said, it did not mean that any were borrowing language or ideas from others. It meant that a common movement in American life was coming to expression. That organized religion should both take direction from it and then put into it an older sanction and power is an instance of how God is revealed in human life. Thus did the prophets and the law; and thus did Jesus fulfil them. Thus also did he enjoin his disciples to fulfil them.

The Social Gospel in the Theological Seminaries

Twenty-five years ago only one theological seminary offered an articulated course on the relation of Christianity to the organic life of society. Today there are few seminaries of first-class rating that do not have several such courses, some even having whole social departments. I have examined Dr. Kelly's book, "Theological Education in America", and a large number of recent catalogs of theological seminaries and have come to the conclusion that with respect to their offerings in the social sciences the seminaries may be

roughly divided into three groups; (1) *Progressive schools,* which treat the social sciences as an important, essential subject, each offering from 4-16 courses, some prescribed, others elective, on subjects like "New Testament Sociology", Sociological aspects of the Primitive Church, Modern Social Problems, The Sermon on the Mount, Social Psychology, Social Ethics, The Church and Social Progress, Sociology and Ethnology, Social Teachings of the Bible, Ethical Viewpoints in Modern Literature, Economics and Religion, The Town and Country Parish, Problems of Racial Contact, Modern Social Movements, the Sociology of Religion, The Survey, its Methods and Uses, Urban Sociology, Social Theories, International Relations, War and Peace, Missionary Sociology, Social Service, Trade Unionism, etc. Several of the theological schools conduct "seminars" and "clinics". (2) The second group of *seminaries proceeding on the laissez faire theory.* They offer from 1-4 courses on some phases of the social problems, but all depends on the personnel of the faculty, the likes and dislikes of individual professors. As these schools do not offer social science courses on principle, the number and emphasis changes from year to year and with changes in the professorship or the demand of progressive students. (3) A group of either small or *intellectually backward seminaries* neither require nor offer any courses on any phase of sociology, some even actively denouncing these studies, either from general lack of scientific interest or from dogmatic prepossessions, such as extreme pre-millennialism. Dr. Kelly says of these seminaries: "They are wholly untouched by the progress and method of science. They are conducted on the assumption that science and religion occupy mutually exclusive fields, if they are not indeed in actual conflict. Many of these schools could not qualify as high grade educational institutions, since they neither speak the language nor use the methods of modern education."

The Seminary Minimum in the Social Sciences

Of course thelogical seminaries cannot be expected to train specialists in the social sciences. But the responsible authorities should regard it as a matter of sacred duty and of conscience to provide the following minimum of social equipment in these serious times of world reconstruction.

(1) Colleges controlled by Church denominations should be strictly held by their synods and boards to require of all pre-theological students at least three social courses, one in general sociology, one in economics and one in the history of civilization, together with a few elective courses. The medical and law schools demand of the colleges recognized by them such preparatory courses as lead directly to their work, and the college authorities are very

anxious to comply with their demand. Why should not colleges founded, controlled and partly supported by the churches arrange similar courses for the pre-theological students?

(2) Seminary boards and faculties should make credits for the above three courses a condition for entrance to the diploma course of their schools, but not only on paper in the catalog, or as a suggestion or recommendation but as an inexorable condition. This demand should be made known to prospective theological students, especially to such as receive their preparatory course in colleges not controlled by church boards. The seminaries should not be expected to spend their precious time in preparatory studies.

(3) An up-to-date theological school should offer and require of each student at the very least one exegetical course on the social teaching of Christ, such as the value of personality, class distinctions, the Kingdom of God, marriage and divorce, the importance of the child, the moralization of the property idea, the perils of great wealth and of dire poverty, the limits of government control, on true and false patriotism, on war, etc., all of which problems were already "burning" in Christ's own time. This important course, if it shall fulfil its object, must follow the strictly scientific method of interpretation. That is, it must be based closely on the text of the New Testament, carefully gathering, scientifically classifying and honestly interpreting the many direct sayings as well as the legitimate implications of the teachings of Jesus on the social problems. No modern theories must be read into the text, nor must seemingly too radical sayings be suppressed or toned down to suit present conditions. Christ must be allowed to speak for himself. Many social errors in the minds of our ministers and people are due to the widespread ignorance on what the Gospels really do say on the above subjects Such a course must also point out the difference between the social teaching of the Old and New Testament. ("Moses said—but I say." Also Hebr. 1: 1-3).

It is true that in its modern technical sense the New Testament does not contain a "sociology"; but neither does it contain a "theology" in the scientific sense. But just as during the past fifty years the new division of the "N. T. Theology" has been differentiated from dogmatic theology, so during the past twenty years the new division of "N. T. Sociology" has been separated from Christian ethics. The reason was in both cases the same, namely, to let the New Testament speak for itself, unmixed with the results of later developments. Under various names, many seminaries already offer such exegetical courses. This study can be made exceedingly helpful and is usually very popular with the students.

Literature for the exegetical study of the social teaching of Christ:

Kent, The Social Teaching of the Prophets and of Jesus.

Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Chrisis.

Vollmer, New Testament Sociology and The Modern Student's Life of Christ.

Horstmann, The Will of God.

(4) As electives may be offered courses on the outstanding social problems, either by the seminar or the deductive, or the historical methods. Courses on the social content of the epistle of James, or the Sermon on the Mount are also very helpful.

(5) The social point of view should be stressed in other courses, especially in Church history.

(6) Applied or practical sociology should also be studied. It aims to investigate the real conditions of society in city and country and the work being actually done to improve conditions.

Besides work in the Seminaries, committees on ordination should make it a point to test the knowledge of the applicant on the social teachings of Christ in their application to present conditions.

Finally, the church judicatories should support their social commissions by sympathy, suggestions and money, for untold good proceeds from their work. Periods for papers and discussions on social subjects should be set apart at the stated meetings of synods and conferences, in addition to special summer schools and convocations, for social discussions.

The above is the minimum the Church should do for her ministers.

How to Find Time For the Social Sciences

A steadily increasing number of seminaries offering courses in social sciences show the way in which time may be found for these most necessary studies. Some of them have extended the regular theological course to four years (as in Germany) while some of our "University" seminaries stress a fourth year graduate course. Furthermore, the required number of hours per week might be raised. A generation ago the students carried from 20 to 25 hours per week and yet found plenty of time for papers, collateral reading, recreation and—horribile dictu—for allotria and loafing. Students of law and medicine usually carry more hours per week than theologians. Usually men do their best work under pressure of time. Most seminaries have made the study of Hebrew and Greek elective. I hate to suggest this, for Greek has been my specialty; but the modernly equipped minister needs other studies much more. Much time may be saved in the seminary by a better co-ordination of nearly related courses and by eliminating repetition. For ex-

ample, catalogs offer courses in Old Testament history, O. T. Introduction, O. T. History, O. T. Religion, O. T. Theology, Messianic Prophecy, Exegesis of several books, etc. In the New Testament courses are offered on N. T. introduction, the N. T. Times, the Life of Christ, or on Paul's Life, exegesis of Romans and Galatians, on N. T. Theology, dogmatic theology, history of dogma, symbolics and so forth. In giving these closely related courses separately, especially when each one is taught by a different instructor, much time is usually wasted by repeating similar or identical lines of thought which could be saved for other courses by a mutual understanding among the professors in charge.

Selected Bibliography

One hardly knows what books to recommend on the social sciences, for the amount of even the good ones is so immense and daily on the increase.

Saeger, Introduction to Economics.

Dow, Sociology and its Problems.

Emory S. Bogardus, History of Social Thought.

James W. Garner, American Foreign Policies.

Niebuhr, Does Civilization Need Religion?

Sir Oliver Lodge, Science and Human Progress.

Ernest R. Groves and Wm. F. Ogburn, American Marriage and Family Relationships.

Horstmann, The Will of God, Can It, Shall It be Done on Earth as It is in Heaven?

Herman Feldman, Prohibition: Its Economic and Industrial Aspects.

R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.

Kresge, The Ever Coming Kingdom of God.

Ruecker, Quest of Character.

Williams, Charles D., The Prophetic Ministry for Today.

Vedder, The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy.

Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question.

Nathusius, Mitarbeit der Kirche an der sozialen Frage.

Rauschenbusch, Prayers of the Social Awakening.

Angell, The Great Illusion.

Die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie.

Von Professor Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

1.

Wenn die letzte Form der neuprotestantischen Theologie den Beinamen der religionsgeschichtlichen trägt, so weist das auf eine besondre theologische Verwendung der Religionsgeschichte hin. Diese kommt zunächst zur Auswirkung in den **geschichtlichen, speziell biblischen Disziplinen.** Ritschl und seine Schüler hatten das Neue Testament gegenüber der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte isoliert und nur Zusammenhänge mit dem Alten Testament anerkannt. Auch bei D. F. Strauß trat die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte als Quelle der neutestamentlichen „Mythen" noch zurück. Dagegen hatte schon der Rationalismus wie der junge Schelling und eine Reihe „Symbolisten" im Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts das Alte und Neue Testament in starke Abhängigkeit von heidnischen Religionen gestellt. Diese Behauptung wurde in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts besonders von dem Orientalisten **Lagarde** (1827—1892) in Göttingen aufgenommen, der dort gleichzeitig mit Ritschl wirkte. Er gewann Einfluß auf eine ganze Reihe von jüngeren Theologen. Lagarde stellte auch schon die prinzipielle Forderung einer rein religionsgeschichtlichen Behandlung des Christentums auf. Er verlangte die Ersetzung der Theologie durch eine allgemeine Religionswissenschaft: „Die Theologie ist nicht eine philosophische, sie ist ausschließlich eine historische Disziplin." „Komparative Religionswissenschaft gilt es zu treiben." Außerdem widmeten sich eine ganze Reihe von **klassischen Philologen** unter Führung Useners und Reitzensteins, der religionsgeschichtlichen Untersuchung des Urchristentums.

Unter diesen Einflüssen wurde das Alte wie das Neue Testament seit dem Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts einer religionsgeschichtlichen Betrachtungsweise auch innerhalb der Theologie unterworfen. Bis dahin hatte auf kritischer Seite in den alttestamentlichen Disziplinen **Wellhausen** und seine zahlreiche Schule die Herrschaft gehabt. Seine Methode war die literarische Quellenkritik. Auf Grund ihrer entwarf er ein Bild der Geschichte Israels, welche diese ganz in das Schema des religionsgeschichtlichen Evolutionismus einstellte. Wie alle Religion, besonders die altarabische, sollte sich auch die israelitische von primitiven Anfängen über den Polytheismus allmählich zum Monotheismus entfaltet haben. In diesem Sinn trug auch schon die Wellhausensche Behandlung des Alten Testaments einen revolutionistisch-religionsgeschichtlichen Charakter.

Die eigentliche religionsgeschichtliche Behandlung des Alten Testaments wollte aber seine Stoffe und Erzählungen besonders über die Ur- und Endzeit, auf außerbiblische Quellen zurückführen. In dieser Richtung wurde **Gunkel** in seinem Buch „Schöpfung und

Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit" (1895) wegweisend. Andre wie besonders **Greßmann** setzten diese Arbeit fort. Dieser entwickelte auch die leitenden Grundsätze. „Das Axiom der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule lautet: Es gibt keinen Stoff in der Welt, der nicht seine Vorgeschichte, keinen Begriff, der nicht seine Anknüpfungspunkte hätte. Dieser Grundsatz gilt auch für die großen und zentralen Erscheinungen wie die israelitischen Propheten oder die Entstehung des Christentums." Nach Greßmann gilt das Axiom der Entwicklung auch für die alt- und neutestamentliche Geschichte, und zwar in dem Sinn, daß sich hier die Entwicklung genau so vollzogen hat, wie auf allen übrigen Gebieten. „Für den theologischen Historiker gelten keine andern Grundsätze als für den profanen, natürlich mutatis mutandis." **Damit erneuert Greßmann die „Voraussetzungslosigkeit" von Strauß und unterstellt die theologische Arbeit dem Dogma des Evolutionismus.** Bei dieser Voraussetzung ist es nur natürlich, daß entscheidende supranaturale Vorstellungen im Alten Testament wie etwa der Messianismus und die Eschatologie aus fremden Quellen hergeleitet wurde.

Diese Methode wendeten Männer wie Wrede (†), Weinel (Jena), Heitmüller (†) und besonders Bousset (†) auf das Neue Testament an. Besonders die metaphysisch-heilsgeschichtlichen Ueberlieferungen wie Jungfrauengeburt, Auferstehung, Himmelfahrt wurden zu Abwandlungen heidnischer Mythen von der wunderbaren Geburt großer Männer, vom sterbenden und auferstehenden Gott. Die Sakramente stammten aus den Mysterien-Religionen. Von der Christologie erklärte Weinel: „Die Christologie war fast fertig, ehe Jesus auf die Erde kam! **Die schärfste zusammenfassende Formel für die religionsgeschichtliche Betrachtung des Christentums gab Gunkel in dem Satz: „Das Christentum ist eine synkretistische Religion."**

Aber auch diese Männer blieben ihrer persönlichen Ueberzeugung nach christliche Theologen und wollten darum im Christentum ein ihm allein eignendes charakteristisches Element herausarbeiten, an welches sich der spezifisch christliche Glaube noch in der Gegenwart heften kann. Dieses Element sollte der **„historische Jesus"** sein. Infolgedessen erscheinen Ende des 19. und Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts eine ganze Anzahl historischer Jesusbilder, von denen neben Harnacks Aufstellungen dasjenige **Boussets** in den Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbüchern das bekannteste wurde. Als Inhalt dieser historischen Leben-Jesu-Forschung kann man etwa folgende Züge nennen. Jesus hat eine Reihe von Reinigungen und Reduktionen an den überlieferten Religion Israels vorgenommen. Seine eigentliche Bedeutung aber liegt darin, daß er die allgemeine sittliche Menschheitsreligion, das heißt den Glauben an Gott,

die Unsterblichkeit und die Tugendübung in besonders kräftiger ja einzigartiger Weise in seiner Seele und Persönlichkeit vollzogen hat. Das gibt den Anlaß ihn auch heute noch als unsern Führer zu werten, ihn auch Mittler zu nennen, ja ein persönliches Verhältnis zu ihm zu behaupten. Wofür Jesus sich selbst hielt, bleibt im Dunkeln; wahrscheinlich hat er in einer besondern Situation seines Lebens zu dem Gedanken gegriffen, er sei der Menschensohn, der Messias. In Wirklichkeit aber ging — metaphysisch beurteilt — seine Persönlichkeit nicht über Menschenmaß hinaus.

So glaubte die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie auf geschichtlichem, religionsvergleichendem Weg den „historischen Jesus" sicher herauszuarbeiten und in ihm auch den Träger der christlichen Gegenwartsreligion zu erfassen. Allein weder die Wissenschaft noch der Glaube beruhigten sich lange bei diesem „historischen Jesus." Rein historisch kritisch angesehen, schien nämlich kein wirklicher Anlaß gerade diese Züge aus der biblischen Ueberlieferung für historisch glaubwürdiger zu halten, zumal die Urteile der einzelnen Forscher stark auseinander gingen. Dazu kam die merkwürdige Aehnlichkeit der übriggebliebenen „historischen" Züge mit religiösen Gegenwartsidealen. Endlich aber konnte sich ein wirklich religiöser Glaube nicht auf einen einfachen, der Vergangenheit angehörigen, Menschen statt auf den lebendigen, gegenwärtigen Gott richten. **Infolgedessen vollzog sich innerhalb der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie selbst ein radikaler Umschwung. Man gab die historische Methode und den „historischen Jesus" preis und setzte an seine Stelle ein Christussymbol, das sich auf die Vernunft begründete.**

Dieser Wendung gab Bousset in einem Vortrag auf dem Weltkongreß für freies Christentum, 1910, Ausdruck über: „Die Bedeutung der Person Jesu für den Glauben. Historische und rationale Grundlagen des Glaubens." Prinzipiell stellt er fest: „So weist die Historie, ernst und nachhaltend betrieben, über sich selbst hinaus und zwingt uns ein anders Fundament außerhalb ihrer zu suchen und das wäre die Ratio." **Der Historismus dankt hier zu Gunsten des Rationalismus ab und kehrt damit zu der geistigen Einstellung des 18. Jahrhunderts zurück.** Die Frage nach der Existenz und Erkennbarkeit des historischen Jesus spielt keine beherrschende Rolle mehr; sein Bild ist untrennbar aus „Dichtung und Wahrheit" zusammengesetzt. Als solches bleibt es ein erhabenes, künstlerisch-religiöses Symbol für den Glauben: „Der Glaube kann nicht verloren gehen, denn er ruht auf seinen eigenen ewigen Fundamenten und überdies würde das Bild Jesu in den Evangelien dennoch stehen bleiben und wenn auch nur als eine große Dichtung, so doch als Dichtung von ewiger, symbolischer Bedeutung." In der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie lebt der Rationalismus, der Aesthe-

tizismus des jungen Schleiermacher, die Christusidee der älteren liberalen Theologie besonders diejenige von D. F. Strauß wieder auf.

Diese Rückwendung der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie ist stark beeinflußt durch die allgemeine Abwendung des modernen Geistes von der Geschichte und der Rückkehr zur Philosophie zu Beginn des 20. Jahrunderts. Am schärfsten gab ihr der Karlsher Philosoph **Artur Drews** Ausdruck, der in den Bahnen seines Lehrers, E. von Hartmann, in seiner „Christusmythe" die Existenz des historischen Jesus überhaupt leugnete, um an ihre Stelle die zeitlose Christusidee zu setzen. **Infolgedessen wurde aus der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie eine religionsphilosophische.** Ihr charakteristischer Vertreter wurde nicht ein historischer Theologe, sondern ein systematischer, nicht ein Religionsgeschichtler, sondern ein Religionsphilosoph: Troeltsch.

2.

Ernst Troeltsch (1865—1923) war ein Schüler Ritschls und Schleiermachers. Er kombinierte ihre Auffassung von dem Wesen der Religion und teilte mit ihnen zunächst „die einfache Glaubensvorstellung von der Wahrheitsgeltung des Christentums." Bald aber schien ihm diese durch die Entwicklung der modernen Religionsgeschichte gefährdet und er sah sich zu **geschichts- und religionsphilosophischen Untersuchungen** gedrängt. Er untersuchte die Frage nach dem Wesen, der Selbständigkeit und Wahrheit der Religion. Er betonte schon dabei — in stärkerem Anschluß an Hegel und die ältere liberale Theologie — die Bedeutung der Metaphysik für die Religion. In entschiedener Abwehr der modernen Gegenströmungen trat er für die **Selbständigkeit und Wahrheit des Theismus** ein. Gegenüber den Versuchen der sozialistisch-materialistischen Religionsphilosophie, die Religion zu einem Produkt materialistisch-wirtschaftlicher Bewegungen zu machen, trat er für die Eigenständigkeit der Religion ein. Auch später als Philosoph hat Troeltsch diese religiöse Position nicht nur theoretisch, sondern auch mit persönlicher kraftvoller Ueberzeugung festgehalten.

Auch seine Verhältnisbestimmung von Christentum und Religionsgeschichte erwächst letztlich aus **apologetischen Motiven.** Sagt er doch in seiner theologisch wichtigsten Schrift „Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte" (1902): „Es handelt sich darum, in erster Linie die Normativität des Christentums von der Religionsgeschichte aus zu gewinnen." Oder wie es an andrer Stelle heißt: „Die erste Aufgabe einer religionsgeschichtlich orientierten Dogmatik muß darin bestehen, zunächst von der Religionsvergleichung her geschichtsphilosophisch die prinzipielle und allgemeine Höchstgeltung des Christentums für unsre Kultur und Le-

benskreis zu erweisen." Die Begründung der christlichen Wahrheit auf eine spezielle Offenbarung und ihre Erfahrung hält Troeltsch für ebenso unmöglich, wie das Festhalten an der Absolutheit der christlichen Religion. Unter ihr versteht er die Auffassung, daß das Christentum auch in aller Zukunft die einzig wahre Religion für die ganze Menschheit sein und bleiben werde. An die Stelle dieses „naiven Absolutheitsanspruches" des Glaubens, soll der wissenschaftliche Erweis der gegenwärtigen Höchststellung des Christentums für unsern europäisch-amerikanischen Kulturkreis treten. Anlaß zu dieser Stellungnahme gibt Troeltsch die **moderne historische Denkweise.** Denn diese stellt alle Erscheinungen in einen kausalen Zusammenhang und gestattet auch dem Christentum keine Sonderstellung. Sie läßt überall nur die gleichen Kräfte wirken und schließt eine besondre supranaturale Offenbarung aus. Wie alle Geschichte ein stetes Werden ist, so auch die des Christentums. Während aber der historische Evolutionismus zu einer völligen Relativierung auch der Christentumsansprüche führt, will Troeltsch durch geschichtsphilosophische Erwägungen wenigstens **die Höchstellung des Christentums in der Gegenwart erweisen.** Er findet in der Geschichte, speziell in der Religionsgeschichte nur eine geringe Zahl typischer Erscheinungen, nämlich „die aus gemeinsamen Stamm erwachsenen Religionen des Judentums, Christentums, Islams, anderseits die großen östlichen Religionen, den Brahmanismus und vor allem den Buddhismus." Aus einer vergleichenden Ueberschau dieser Religionstypen soll sich von selbst ein Wertmaßstab erzeugen, dessen Anwendung zu dem Resultat führt: „Das Christentum ist in der Tat unter den großen Religionen die stärkste und gesammeltste Offenbarung der personalistischen Religiosität." Von diesem Maßstab und seiner Anwendung muß allerdings Troeltsch selbst zugestehen: „Ein solcher Maßstab ist freilich Sache der persönlichen Ueberzeugung und in letzter Hinsicht ruht die Entscheidung für das Christentum auch als höchste Religion in der Gegenwart auf einer axiomatischen Tat."

Ist das aber richtig, so endet Troeltsch bei derselben Begründung, wie sie stets die kirchliche Theologie gegeben hat. **Die Ueberzeugung von der Wahrheit des Christentums ruht auch hier nicht auf einem wissenschaftlichen, auch nicht auf einem religionsgeschichtlichen Beweis, sondern auf Glauben und persönlicher Entscheidung.** Steht es aber so, dann hat der Glaube gar keinen Anlaß sich mit religionsgeschichtlicher Spitzenstellung des Christentums zu begnügen, sondern er kann seiner vollen Absolutheit damit für alle Zukunft gewiß bleiben. Denn die „moderne historische Methode" und der historische Evolutionismus sind nur Erscheinungen einer die Eigenart des Christentums von vornherein unmöglichmachenden Weltanschauung. Wie schon bei Strauß festgestellt wurde, handelt

es sich nicht um eine historisch-exakte Methode auf der einen und eine dogmatisch-phantastische auf der andern Seite. Vielmehr prallen zwei dogmatische Weltanschauungen aufeinander, die sich beide auf eine „axiomatische Tat" begründen.

Die eigentliche **Aufgabe der Dogmatik** ist nach Troeltsch die Bestimmung des **Wesens des Christentums.** Sie läßt sich nicht einfach auf historischem Weg lösen, wie das Ritschl und die Vertreter des „historischen Jesus" meinten, sondern auch sie ist eine religionsphilosophische Schöpfung. „Wesensbestimmung ist Wesensgestaltung. Die jeweilige Wesensbestimmung ist die jeweilige historische Neugestaltung des Christentums." In seiner aus dem Nachlaß herausgegebenen „Glaubenslehre" (1925) — nach einer Heidelberger Vorlesung aus dem Jahr 1911—1912 — ist „das Christentum die entscheidende und prinzipielle Wendung zur Persönlichkeitsreligion." Jesus ist selber das Zentrum der erlösenden Selbstoffenbarung Gottes. Mit einem Wort gefaßt, kann man das Christentum bezeichnen als das „Prinzip der religiösen Wiedergeburt oder Höhergeburt zu einem Reich des gotterfüllten Geistes." Diese neuprotestantische Wesensbestimmung des Christentums, welche Schleiermacher, besonders Rothe mit Ritschl verknüpft, kontrastiert Troeltsch selbst mit der altprotestantischen: „Das Wesen des freien Christentums wird man in Kürze mit folgenden zwei Merkmalen bezeichnen können: Es ersetzt erstlich die kirchlich-autoritative Bindung durch eine aus der Kraft des überlieferten Gemeingeistes sich frei und individuell bildende Innerlichkeit; es verwandelt zweitens die alte christliche Grundidee einer wunderbaren Heilung der durch die Sünde tötlich infizierten Menschheit in den Gedanken einer erlösenden Erhebung und Besserung der Persönlichkeit durch die Gewinnung eines höheren Personenlebens aus Gott." **Der kirchliche Zug wird mithin durch den individuellen, die religiös-supranaturale Versöhnung der Sünde durch eine evolutionistische Persönlichkeitsentwicklung, die enger mit Gott verknüpft, ersetzt.**

Zu der Aufgabe des „historischen Jesus" zu Gunsten einer Christusidee hat auch Troeltsch und zwar wesentlich in der Richtung von Bousset Stellung genommen. Auch ihm genügt **die Idee von einem persönlichen Erlöser,** die er sozial-psychologisch begründet. Die Vorstellung einer Persönlichkeit bindet sozial und kultisch einen Kreis von Menschen viel enger zusammen als eine bloße abstrakte Idee oder ein blasses Ideal. Auch hier grenzt Troeltsch die neuprotestantische Auffassung sehr bestimmt von der altprotestantischen ab und zwar mit folgendem Zugeständnis: „Es ist in voller Klarheit und Bestimmtheit zu sagen, daß eine wirkliche innere Notwendigkeit der geschichtlichen Person Jesu für das Heil nur bei der altkirchlich rechtgläubigen Erlösungs-, Autoritäts- und Kirchenidee

besteht." Danach ist nicht nur die Gottheit, sondern auch die Menschheit Christi als einer historischen Persönlichkeit durch den Neuprotestantismus nicht mehr gesichert.

Zusammenfassend wird danach bei Troeltsch die Absolutheit des Christentums durch seine geschichtliche Höchststellung in der Gegenwart und in unserm Kulturkreis ersetzt, aber auch diese nicht streng wissenschaftlich erwiesen, sondern nur durch eine axiomatische Glaubenstat festgestellt. Die religionsphilosophische Konstruktion des Christentums gibt ihm zum Inhalt eine sittlich-religiöse Höherentwicklung und Reinigung des Menschen. Nur die Idee eines „historischen Jesus" läßt sich als sozialpsychologisch wertvoll erkennen, die wirkliche Menschheit Jesu aber ebensowenig dogmatisch begründen wie seine Gottheit.

3.

Ebenso stark als der Dogmatik hat Troeltsch sein Interesse der **Ethik** und ihrem Verhältnis zur modernen Kultur zugewandt. Darüber hat er vor allem in dem großen Werk **„Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen"** (1912) gehandelt. Die urchristliche Ethik soll wesentlich asketisch, transzendent und eschatologisch gerichtet sein. „Es ist ein Ideal, das eine neue Welt zu seiner vollen Durchführung verlangt, die entsprechend Jesus auch in dem Gottesreich verkündet hat, aber es ist ein Ideal, das in der dauernden irdischen Welt nicht ohne Kompromiß durchführbar ist." Ein solcher Kompromiß liegt sowohl in der doppelten Ethik des Katholizismus, wie in der Unterscheidung zwischen Amts- und Personalmoral im Luthertum vor. Die spiritualistischen Sekten lehnen auf Grund der Bergpredigt jeden Kompromiß ab, verzichten aber damit auf alle Kulturwirkungen. In der Gegenwart erscheint für Troeltsch das Verhältnis zwischen christlicher Ethik und Kultur völlig ungeklärt. „Unter diesen Umständen ist das Ergebnis unsrer Untersuchung die Einsicht in die problematische Lage aller christlich-sozialen Arbeit. Soll es eine christlich-soziale Bemeisterung der Lage geben, so werden hier neue Gedanken nötig sein, die noch nicht gedacht sind." Aber im Grund steht für Troeltsch doch schon fest, daß die christliche Ethik allein nicht in der Lage ist, die moderne Kultur sittlich zu bemeistern, sondern zur Ergänzung ihrer religiösen Einseitigkeit einer mit ihr vereinbarten Kulturethik bedarf. „Das christliche Ethos kann für sich allein nicht leben in einer dauernden Welt." **Troeltsch gibt mithin auch die Absolutheit der christlichen Ethik auf.** Das Schleiermachersche und besonders Rothesche Programm einer christlichen Kulturethik begegnet bei Troeltsch einem starken Skeptizismus hinsichtlich seiner Durchführbarkeit. Der neuprotestantische Kulturprotestantismus arbeitet selbst an seiner Auflösung.

Das Christentum hat nach Troeltsch **drei religiös-ethische Sozialformen** hervorgebracht: **die Kirche, die Sekte, die Mystik.** Diese drei Formen werden geschichtlich wie prinzipiell nebeneinander und einander gleich gestellt. Auch die Absolutheit der Kirche wird in dem Sinn von Troeltsch aufgegeben, daß sie durch die Sekte und die rein individualistische Mystik ergänzt wird.

Alle dogmatischen, ethischen, soziologischen Umgestaltungen des Christentums läßt Troeltsch durch die **moderne Kultur** bedingt sein. Ihrer Entstehung hat er den umfangreichen Band „Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit" (in „Kultur der Gegenwart," Teil 4, 2. Auflage, 1909) gewidmet und seine Resultate kurz zusammengefaßt in „Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt" (1911). Nach Troeltsch ist seit dem 18. Jahrhundert ein moderner Kulturtypus erwachsen, der neben die Kultur der Antike und des Mittelalters tritt. Formell läßt sich allerdings diese Kultur positiv nur durch Individualismus, Autonomie, Diesseitigkeitstendenz charakterisieren, während „die Inhalte des autonom Entwickelten und Angeeigneten grundverschieden sind. Es tritt eine zunehmende Kompliziertheit und Widerspruchsfülle in der modernen Welt ein." **Im Verhältnis zu dieser modernen Kultur erscheint der Altprotestantismus durchaus unmodern,** wie die charakteristische These formuliert: **„Der Protestantismus ist zuerst und in seinen wesentlichen Grundzügen und Ausprägungen eine Umformung der mittelalterlichen Idee."** Besonders unmodern ist das Luthertum mit seinem Supranaturalismus, Pessimismus, seiner Geschichtlichkeit und Kirchlichkeit. Moderner ist schon das vom Humanismus stärker beeinflußte Reformiertentum, noch moderner sind die Spiritualisten mit ihrer Auflösung der supranaturalen und historischen Elemente im Christentum. Im einzelnen schließt sich Troeltsch hier an Rothe, Strauß, Lagarde und vor allen Dingen an den Philosophen Dilthey an. Diese Ausführung über den Altprotestantismus sollen die Notwendigkeit eines Neuprotestantismus in dem früher charakterisierten Sinn begründen, der sich wesentlich mit dem Rationalismus des 18. Jahrhunderts deckt: „Gott, Freiheit, Unsterblichkeit sind die symbolischen Bücher des neuen Protestantismus, und das menschliche Leben Jesu ist seine Christologie." Aber von diesem Neuprotestantismus muß Troeltsch selbst zugestehen: „Eine geschlossene Gestalt seines religiösen Gedankens und seiner Ethik hat er nicht gefunden." Troeltsch hat sie ihm nicht gegeben zumal er selbst zuletzt von der Theologie zur Philosophie übergegangen ist. Aber auch kein andrer Theologe hat diese Aufgabe bisher erfolgreich übernommen. **Die spezifisch neuprotestantisch religionsgeschichtlich-religionsphilosophische Theologie ist schon an das Ende ihrer Entwicklung gelangt.**

Die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu.

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

(Schluß.)

Der Bericht des Lukas läßt aber absolut keinen Zweifel zu:

1. Daß die Jungfrau Maria verlobt war mit einem Mann mit Namen Joseph aus dem Hause Davids;

2. daß der Sohn, den Maria gebären soll, Gottes des Höchsten Sohn genannt werden wird;

3. daß dieser ihr Sohn über das Haus Jakob König sein und seines Königreichs kein Ende sein werde;

4. daß Joseph nicht der leibliche Vater Jesu ist, sondern daß in Maria der Heilige Geist, die Kraft des Höchsten, wie der Engel ausdrücklich hervorhebt, die Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes bewirkt hat; daraus folgt

5. daß auch das von Maria „geborene Heilige" Sohn Gottes genannt wird.

Sehr bezeichnend für unsre Frage ist der Einwand, den Maria auf die erste Ankündigung des Engels erhebt: Wie wird das sein, da ich keinen Mann erkenne. Darauf erklärt dann der Engel das Geheimnis: empfangen vom Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria.

Der ganze Bericht atmet eine wunderbare Klarheit. Maria wird durch des Engels unerwartete Anrede an sie als die Begnadigte (*κεχαριτομένη*) bei ihrer Demut in Verwirrung gesetzt. Da diese aber völlig geziemend und deshalb kein Anzeigen von Unglauben ist, so kann der Engel sofort zu seiner Ankündigung fortschreiten. Ihr wunderbarer Inhalt übersteigt alles menschliche Denken und schließt eine große Freudenbotschaft in sich. Für Maria war sie dadurch verständlich, daß sie sich aus lauter Worten der alttestamentlichen Verheißung für ihr Volk und Haus zusammensetzte. Insbesondre mußte die Anlehnung an das bei Jesaia von dem Jungfrauensohn Geweissagte sie über jeden Anstoß an die ihr eröffnete Aussicht hinwegheben, wenn auch deren Möglichkeit ihr Denken übersteigt (Vers 34).

So stimmen also die beiden Evangelisten Matthäus und Lukas in Bezug auf die übernatürliche Herkunft des Kindes der Maria aufs bestimmteste überein. Diese ist das Zentrum der beiden Vorgeschichten und dafür als apostolische Verkündigung tritt das ganze kirchliche Altertum ein und es hat an Joh. 1, 11—14 und an Gal. 4, 4, also an noch zwei weiteren apostolischen Zeugnissen, eine unverkennbare und unanfechtbare Stütze. Der Tatbestand des Satzes des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses: empfangen vom Heiligen

Geist, geboren von Maria der Jungfrau, steht deshalb, völlig unabhängig von dem sonstigen Wert der Vorgeschichte, an und für sich fest. Es ist wahr, daß die Vorgeschichte im Matthäus- und Lukas-Evangelium von einander abweichen und es nicht leicht ist, die chronologische Abfolge der in beiden Evangelien berichteten Begebenheiten aufzuhellen. Die Gegner der Jungfraugeburt Jesu berufen sich hierauf. Aber die Glaubwürdigkeit der beiden Vorgeschichten darf darum doch nicht beanstandet werden. Die Geschichtsforschung stößt nicht selten auf differente und bei ihrem hohen Alter unausgleichbare Meldungen über Dinge, deren Tatsächlichkeit nichts destoweniger unanfechtbar ist. In unserm Fall aber reichen die Berichte einander ergänzend die Hand, schließen sich also nicht gegenseitig aus und bezüglich der Jungfraugeburt Jesu stimmen sie miteinander überein. Wer aber aus dogmatischen Gründen, weil er nicht glauben will oder kann, daß Jesus ist wahrhaftiger Gott und wahrhaftiger Mensch, die evangelischen Berichte verwirft, der hat bei der Harmonie so verschieden angelegter Vorgeschichten im Hauptpunkt keine Veranlassung, die wissenschaftliche Beweisbarkeit der berichteten Begebenheiten und insbesondere der übernatürlichen Geburt Jesu für unmöglich zu erklären.

Da nun Matthäus sich direkt und Lukas indirekt auf die Weissagung bei Jesaias 7, 14 beziehen, liegt es mir nun ob, dieselbe näher zu betrachten und zu erforschen, ob die hiergegen vorgebrachten Einwendungen stichhaltig sind oder nicht.

Jefferson (Seite 86—89) findet in der genannten Stelle bei Jesaias keine Beziehung auf Jesus und seine Mutter. Er schreibt, man habe angenommen, daß in dieser Stelle die Rede sei von der Jungfrau Maria und daß der Knabe, dessen Name Emmanuel heißt, Jesus sei. Aber das Studium der Bibel, das „wissenschaftliche" Studium meint er, habe ihn überzeugt, daß in jenem Verse überhaupt keine Beziehung auf Jesus oder seine Mutter liege. „Ich werde nie die Sensation vergessen," schreibt er, „die über mich kam, als mein Professor des Hebräischen, mir vor Jahren eine Erklärung hierüber gegeben hat. Es schien mir, als ob ein Teil der Erdrinde eingestürzt sei. Aber es ist kein Zweifel, daß diese Interpretation richtig ist." So Jefferson.

Nun, mein Professor des Hebräischen gab mir die Erklärung, daß in jener Stelle des Propheten offenbar und jeden Zweifel ausschließend von der Jungfrau Maria und ihrem Sohn Jesus die Rede sei, so daß dem Propheten von Gott hier in einer prophetischen Offenbarung die Geburt Jesu von Maria der Jungfrau enthüllt wurde. Seitdem habe ich gar manche Erklärung dieser Stelle gelesen und sorgfältig studiert, auch gegnerische und habe die Ueberzeugung gewonnen, daß die mir von meinem Professor gegebene

die richtige ist und daß alle Einwände der sogenannten höheren Bibelkritik sich als nicht stichhaltig erweisen. Dieser mein Lehrer war übrigens ein vorzüglicher Bibelkenner, ein in der Sprache des Alten Testaments wohl unterrichteter Mann, der mit rechter Akribie in seinen biblischen Forschungen zu Werk ging. Dies Lob muß ich ihm mit Dankbarkeit spenden, wenn ich auch in manchen andern Fragen jetzt nicht mit ihm übereinstimmen kann. In der vorliegenden Frage muß ich ihm zustimmen. Jefferson demonstriert so:

The Hebrew word translated "Virgin" was not properly translated. That word does not mean "virgin". In other parts of the Old Testament, where the word occurs, it is translated "maiden" or "damsel." When the Old Testament was translated into Greek, unfortunately a Greek word was chosen meaning "virgin", and that is the reason why the word "virgin" occurs in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The Hebrew word means "marriageable woman," that is a woman that is old enough to be married, and there is no reference in the word to virginity. The prophet says that a marriageable woman shall conceive and bear a son, and that when the baby is born, his mother will call him Immanuel, which means "God is with us."

Wie verhält es sich nun mit dieser Beweisführung? Die Stelle Jes. 7, 14 lautet: Darum so wird auch der Herr selbst ein Zeichen geben: Siehe, die Jungfrau ist schwanger und wird einen Sohn gebären, den wird sie heißen Immanuel. Das ist genau der hebräische Text ins Deutsche übersetzt. Die Septuaginta (die Uebersetzung der Bücher des Alten Testaments in die griechische Sprache, begonnen um 280 v. Chr.) übersetzte die Stelle: Siehe, **die** Jungfrau wird im Leib haben und gebären einen Sohn usw. Der Ausdruck „siehe," der bestimmte Artikel (**die** Jungfrau) und die Partizipialadjektiven: „praegnans," „gravida" und „pariens" weisen, auch noch abgesehen von dem jedenfalls auffallenden Ausdruck „Jungfrau" deutlich darauf hin, daß dem Propheten ein großes, wunderbares Bild vor der **Seele** steht, auf welches er den König Ahas hinweist, als auf das Zeichen, das Jehova selbst geben werde.

Es geschah nämlich in den Tagen des Königs Ahas vom Reich Juda, so erzählt Jesaia im Anfang des siebenten Kapitels, daß die Könige von Syrien und Israel mit vereinten Streitkräften gegen Jerusalem zogen, um die Stadt zu erobern. Da erbebte das Herz des Ahas und das Herz seines Volkes, wie die Bäume des Waldes erbeben vor dem Angesicht des Sturmes. Da sprach der Herr zu Jesaia: Gehe hinaus Ahas entgegen, du und dein Sohn Schear-Jasub an das Ende der Wasserleitung des oberen Teiches an die Straße des Walkerfeldes und sage zu ihm: Siehe, daß du dich ruhig verhaltest (das ist Vertraue auf Gott!), fürchte dich nicht und dein Herz zage nicht vor diesen Enden rauchender Feuerbrände (das

heißt sie sind fertig, ihre Kraft ist nicht mehr für dich zu fürchten . . . .)

Und der Herr fuhr fort, zu Ahas zu reden und sprach: Fordere dir ein Zeichen von dem Herrn, deinem Gott, es sei in der Tiefe unten oder in der Höhe oben (das ist auf Erden oder am Himmel, so groß und unerhört, als du nur willst zur Bestätigung meiner Verheißung). Und Ahas sprach: Ich will keines begehren und den Herrn nicht versuchen. Da sprach Jesaia im Namen Gottes: Höret also, Haus Davids! Ist es euch zu wenig, die Menschen zu ermüden, daß ihr auch meinen Gott ermüdet (das heißt durch Verachtung der Worte der Propheten, die sich vergebens bei euch müde geredet. Soll nun auch Gott selbst, der unmittelbar durch ein großes Wunderzeichen zu euch reden will, von euch verschmäht werden?) **Darum** (weil du heuchlerisch kein Zeichen wählen willst, nur deiner menschlichen Politik ungehindert nachgehen willst), **darum** wird der Herr selbst euch ein Zeichen geben: Siehe, die Jungfrau wird empfangen usw.

Das ist der Zusammenhang, den man wohl beachten muß, um die Verheißung richtig zu erfassen. Das Wort Jungfrau ist die Uebersetzung des hebräischen Wortes Ha-Almah. Dieses Wort kommt noch an sechs Stellen der Bibel vor, nämlich 1. Mose 24, 43; 2. Mose 2, 8; Psalm 68, 26; Sprüche 30, 19; Hohe Lied 1, 3; 6, 8, und bedeutet überall dasselbe, was unser deutsches Wort „Jungfrau" bedeutet, doch mit dem Unterschied, daß es auch den Begriff des jugendlichen Alters mit dem des Standes der Jungfräulichkeit verbindet. An der einzigen sehr dunklen Stelle, Spr. 30, 19, bedeutet es wenigstens nicht das Gegenteil, in Hohe Lied 1, 3 und 6, 8 steht es sogar im Gegensatz zu den verheirateten Personen, Frauen und Nebenfrauen des Königs.

Almah, von dem Zeitwort „alam" abgeleitet, welches heißt verbergen und nur in dieser Bedeutung vorkommt, heißt die **Verborgene,** das ist die junge Person, die, sowie sie aus dem Kindesalter tritt, in der Wohnung ihrer Mutter verborgen gehalten wird, also nicht in der Oeffentlichkeit bei Festen usw. erscheinen darf bis zu ihrer Vermählung.

Es bedeutet also die heranreifende Jungfrau, „virgo nubilis," „marriageable woman." Wenn man aber meint, darin liege keine Beziehung zur Jungfräulichkeit, so verkennt man ganz und gar den Sprachgebrauch und die jüdische Sitte. Gerade die Jungfrauschaft ist darin ausgedrückt, wie Hieronymus, der berühmte Schriftausleger und Kenner der hebräischen Sprache, treffend bemerkt.

Non solum puella vel virgo sed cum epistasei virgo abscondita dicitur et secreta, quae nunquam parturit virorum aspectibus sed magna parentum diligentia custodita.

Und er bemerkt dazu, daß auch in der punischen Sprache Jungfrau im eigentlichen Sinn „almah" genannt werde.

Daß für den Begriff der Jungfräulichkeit ein eignes Wort vorhanden sei, nämlich Bethulah, schließt diese Bedeutung für Almah nicht aus, um so weniger, da jenes eine ähnliche Grundbedeutung hat wie dieses. Bathal, das Zeitwort, wovon das Substantiv Bethulah abgeleitet ist, heißt nämlich scheiden, absondern, also Bethulah die Abgesonderte wie Almah die Verborgene und zwar gerade zum Schutz ihrer Jungfräulichkeit und doch wird selbst Bethulah (Joel 1,8) von einer jungen Vermählten gebraucht. Für eine junge Person hat die hebräische Sprache drei Wörter: Naarah, griechisch νεανίς, lateinisch „puella," Mädchen, was mehr die Jugend; Bethulah, lateinisch „virgo," was mehr die Jungfräulichkeit hervorhebt und Almah was beide Begriffe, die Jugend und Jungfräulichkeit miteinander verbindet. Die Septuaginta gibt Almah gewöhnlich mit νεανίς, aber an unsrer Stelle: Jes. 7, 14 und 1. Mose 24, 43 (wo Abrahams Knecht, ausgesandt, für Isaak eine Frau zu suchen, betet: Wenn nur eine Jungfrau herauskommt an den Brunnen, Wasser zu schöpfen usw.) mit παρθένος: die Vulgata an diesen beiden Stellen mit „virgo," sonst mit „puella," „juvencula," „adulescentula"; die syrische Uebersetzung, Peschito = die Getreue genannt, hört an unsrer Stelle Bethulah, das Targum des Jonathan Ulemthah; die arabische Uebersetzung sowie Matth. 1, 23 und Lukas 1, 31 haben „virgo." Diese alle halten an dem Begriff der Jungfrauschaft fest. Und was der Glaube der Judenschaft bezüglich der Herkunft des Christus, des Messias war, zeigt die Stelle bei Johannes 7, 25—27. Daß der wieder zum Judentum abgefallene Aquilas, die Ebioniten Theodotion und Symmachus und einige Rabbiner νεανίς, vorziehen, bringt ihr Standpunkt mit sich. Es ist auch sehr bezeichnend, daß im ganzen christlichen Altertum nur die sogenannten Doketen, welche lehrten, Christus habe nur einen Scheinleib gehabt und die Ebioniten, welche in Christus nur einen Menschen erkannten, die Geburt Jesu von der Jungfrau verwarfen. Die Sozinianer in der Neuzeit lehrten ebenfalls, daß Jesus bloßer Mensch sei, aber übernatürlich erzeugt.

Aus diesen Ausführungen geht klar hervor, daß die Stelle Jes. 7, 14 messianisch und daß der Erlöser von einer Jungfrau geboren wurde. Nun weisen die Gegner noch auf die folgenden Worte der Prophetie hin: „Milch und Honig wird er essen, bis er weiß, das Böse zu verwerfen und das Gute zu wählen. Denn ehe der Knabe verstehen wird, zu verwerfen das Böse und zu wählen das Gute, wird verödet sein das Land, vor dessen zwei Königen dir graut." Man sagt: Wenn der Prophet an Jesus von Nazareth hierbei gedacht hätte, so wäre er in großem Irrtum befangen ge-

wesen, denn Jesus von Nazareth wurde erst 700 Jahre, nachdem Jesaia diese Worte gesprochen, geboren und wie konnte er da ein Zeichen für Ahas sein?

Wenn dazu Jefferson bemerkt: Der Prophet sagte: Gott wird dir ein Zeichen geben und er wird es dir sehr bald geben, so legt er dem Propheten etwas in den Mund, was nicht in der betreffenden Stelle steht. Der Prophet sagte nur: Darum wird euch der Herr selbst ein Zeichen geben und daß er dies sehr bald geben werde, hat Jefferson sich hinzugedacht. Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, daß der heuchlerische Ahas ein Zeichen vom Herrn, „es sei in der Tiefe unten oder in der Höhe oben" verschmäht hatte, und daß darum der Prophet in Gottes Auftrag feierlich erklärte: „Darum wird der Herr selbst euch ein Zeichen geben."

Und dieses Zeichen ist eben der Sohn der Jungfrau, dessen Name Immanuel sein soll; Immanuel, das ist Gott mit uns. Darin liegt ausgedrückt: Das wird er auch für euch sein; denn so gewiß die Jungfrau, die Mutter des Messias, durch ein ganz unerhörtes Wunder empfangen und gebären wird, und ihr Kind im vollkommensten Sinn „Gott mit uns," das heißt der menschgewordene Gott und Erlöser der Menschheit ist, so gewiß wird um seinetwillen der Anschlag der Feinde gegen das Haus Davids vereitelt werden. Dies wird in **kürzerer Frist** geschehen, als einst das Kind der Jungfrau, der Immanuel, zu den Unterscheidungsjahren kommen wird. **Für dich** und dein Haus aber hat dies große Zeichen wegen eures Unglaubens nichts Tröstliches. Denn nur vor dem Untergang wird Davids Haus bewahrt bleiben. Dein Mangel an Gottvertrauen aber und dein Hilfesuchen bei Assyrien wird auch über dein Land das Verderben herbeiziehen und es gleichfalls der Verödung preisgeben. Dieses Verderben wird dann vom Propheten in den Versen 17—25 näher beschrieben.

Und buchstäblich ging in dieser Weise die Prophezeiung in Erfüllung.

Wer die Jungfrau und ihr Kind ist, darüber sind, wie wir gesehen, die Evangelisten und die ganze christliche Ueberlieferung einstimmig. In dem Augenblick, da Menschen die Verheißung Gottes umstürzen wollen, erinnert der Prophet den Ahas an die seinem Ahnen David gewordene messianische Verheißung (2. Samuel 7, 12—16), die dem Ahas, wenn er gläubig war, zum festesten Grund seines Gottvertrauens gereichen mußte. Die **Jungfrau,** die Gott dem Propheten vor sein geistiges Auge führt samt ihrem wunderbaren Kind, ist dieselbe, die dem Ahas wahrscheinlich durch den Propheten Micha (5, 1) in Erinnerung gebracht war, die in Bethlehem Ephrata den gebären soll, der in Israel Herr sein wird, welches Ausgang von Anfang und von Ewigkeit her gewesen ist,

bis zu dessen wunderbaren Geburt der Herr sein Volk preisgeben will (Micha 5, 2. 3). Es ist das Weib, auf das beim Untergang des Volkes Jeremia als auf den Stern der Hoffnung hinweist mit den Worten: „Der Herr wird ein Neues (unerhörtes Wunder) im Land erschaffen: Das Weib wird einen Mann umschließen," und mit ihm wird der Segen der Gerechtigkeit und Heiligkeit kommen! Es ist die jungfräuliche Mutter des Erlösers, deren Jungfrauschaft und jungfräuliche Mutterschaft schon dadurch genügend im Alten Bund bezeugt wird, daß nie von einem menschlichen Vater des Messias die Rede ist.

Eine solche Hinweisung paßte auch ganz zur Größe des Augenblicks; auf ein solches Wunderzeichen hinzudeuten nach Verschmähung der Wahl eines Zeichens „in der Tiefe unten oder in der Höhe oben," war Gottes würdig; eine solche Prüfung des Glaubens des Ahas war die passendste Antwort auf seine Heuchelei; auch konnte eine solche Erinnerung es erklärlich machen, wie Gott sogar einem Ahas helfe, und zwar zugleich in den nun hereinbrechenden Strafgerichten der leuchtende Hoffnungsstern für alle Guten.

Ueberdies ergibt sich die **Notwendigkeit** dieser messianischen Auffassung auch aus dem Zusammenhang mit dem folgenden. Weil Ahas in seinem Unglauben menschliche Hilfe sucht, so wird sein Helfer ihm zur Geißel, seinem Volk zum Verderben. Der König von Assyrien wird zwar die feindlichen Könige überwältigen, aber dann selbst ein viel mächtigerer und gefährlicherer Feind für Juda werden und es dem Untergang preisgeben. — **Nur ein Trost,** nur eine Hoffnung leuchtet dem Propheten in diese Nacht des Unglücks hinein: Es ist das Kind der Jungfrau. **Sein** Land ist es, das die Assyrer verwüsten. Aber die Anschläge der Feinde Israels müssen zu Schanden werden. Kapitel 8.

So stimmt denn das Alte Testament mit dem Neuen darin vollkommen überein, daß der Messias, Jesus Christus, ist geboren von der Jungfrau Maria. Und wie Gott dem Propheten Jesaia das ganze Leben und Leiden, den Tod und die Verherrlichung seines einigen Sohnes geoffenbart hat, so daß er den Namen des Evangelisten unter den Propheten erhielt, so hat er ihm auch seine übernatürliche Empfängnis und wunderbare Geburt enthüllt.

Wenn Jefferson und andre meinen, daß weder im Evangelium Markus noch in dem des Johannes, weder in der Apostelgeschichte noch in den Briefen der Apostel die Jungfraugeburt vorkomme, so ist das insofern richtig, daß dieselbe nicht ausdrücklich genannt wird. Aber wäre das auch notwendig? Genügt es nicht, daß zwei der Evangelien übereinstimmend dieselbe berichten? Und sind denn alle Begebenheiten, welche Matthäus und Lukas erzählen, auch im

Evangelium des Markus und Johannes berichtet? Und doch zweifelt man sie deswegen nicht an. Uebrigens, und das ist doch von ausschlaggebender Bedeutung, hat Markus sein Evangelium charakterisiert als das „Evangelium von Jesu Christo, **dem Sohn Gottes.**" Sodann berichtet Markus die Stimme vom Himmel bei der Taufe Jesu: „Du bist mein lieber Sohn, an dem ich Wohlgefallen habe." Sogar die unreinen Geister, die Jesus in göttlicher Allmacht gezwungen hat, ihre unglücklichen Opfer zu verlassen, bekennen laut in Gegenwart vor vielen Zeugen, daß Er ist der Heilige Gottes, der Sohn Gottes und alle wußten, daß Er der Sohn Marias war, welche unter ihnen lebte, die sie alle kannten (zum Beispiel Markus 1, 21 ff.). Und erst Johannes, der in dem sogenannten Prolog zu seinem Evangelium Jesum nennt das ewige Wort, das im Anfang bei Gott war und Gott war und dann schreibt: „Und das Wort ward Fleisch und wohnte unter uns und wir sahen seine Herrlichkeit, eine Herrlichkeit als des eingeborenen Sohnes vom Vater, voller Gnade und Wahrheit." Und derselbe Johanes schrieb sein Evangelium, „auf daß ihr glaubet, Jesus sei der Christ, der Sohn Gottes, und daß ihr durch den Glauben das Leben habet in seinem Namen" (Joh. 20, 31). Dasselbe bezeugt er in seinen Briefen wiederholt (zum Beispiel 1. Joh. 1, 7; 5, 1, 11, 12, 20). In der Apostelgeschichte wird an vielen Stellen erzählt, daß die Apostel Jesum predigten als den wahrhaftigen Sohn Gottes, der zu unsrer Erlösung am Kreuz gestorben, aber von den Toten auferstanden ist. Sie hatten nicht notwendig die Geburt Jesu von der Jungfrau ausdrücklich zu erwähnen. Wenn aber Paulus nicht überzeugt gewesen wäre von der Geburt seines Heilandes von der Jungfrau, wie könnten wir dann die Stelle in seinem Brief an die Philipper (2. Kapitel) erklären: „Ein jeglicher sei gesinnt, wie Jesus Christus auch war, welcher, ob er wohl in göttlicher Gestalt war, hielt er's nicht für einen Raub, Gott gleich sein, sondern entäußerte sich selbst, nahm Knechtsgestalt an, ward gleich wie ein andrer Mensch und an Gebärden als ein Mensch erfunden." Ja, man darf kühn behaupten, daß Johannes und Paulus so sehr von dieser großen, grundlegenden und lebenspendenden Wahrheit von der Gottheit Jesu Christi durchdrungen waren, daß man leichter aus ihren Schriften schließen könnte: Er wäre vielleicht überhaupt nicht wahrer Mensch gewesen, da er wahrhaftiger Gott war. Aber beides steht ihnen felsenfest. Er war wahrhaftiger Gott und wahrhaftiger Mensch.

War Jesus Christus aber wahrhaftig der Sohn Gottes, so entstammte er nicht einem menschlichen Vater; dann kann er nur sein empfangen vom Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria. Ein andrer Schluß ist logisch unmöglich.

Nun aber suchen sich die Gegner der Jungfraugeburt zu helfen und Jefferson ist nur einer derselben, sprechend in ihrem Namen. Diese berufen sich darauf, daß Lukas schreibt, Joseph wurde für den Vater Jesu gehalten („was supposed to be His father"); ferner werde in den Evangelien mehr als einmal Joseph der Vater Jesu genannt. So schreibe Lukas: „Seine Eltern brachten Jesus in den Tempel," ferner: „Seine Eltern brachten ihn nach Jerusalem," ferner: Sogar Maria habe gesagt: „Siehe, dein Vater und ich haben dich mit Schmerzen gesucht." Wie erklärt man sich dies. Ihr Wortführer ist naiv genug zu schreiben (Seite 93): Es scheine ihm, als ob es zwei Ueberlieferungen („traditions") in früheren Jahren in Palästina gegeben habe: Nach der einen wäre Joseph als Vater Jesu gehalten worden und nach der andern wäre Gott als sein Vater geglaubt worden. Diese beiden Ueberlieferungen seien in unser Neues Testament aufgenommen worden, so daß, wenn jemand an die Jungfraugeburt glaubt, er dann in der Schrift einen Beweis für seinen Glauben finden kann; und wenn jemand nicht an die Jungfraugeburt glaubt, dann auch für sein Nichtglauben einen Beweis darin findet. Er schließt:

These are the facts, then, which have been making their impression on the men of our day.

Hierauf will ich nur ganz kurz erwidern: Es war die allsorgende Weisheit Gottes, daß sie der jungfräulichen Mutter des Erlösers in Joseph einen würdigen, unbescholtenen Beschützer gab, auf daß sie in den Augen der Menschen, welche von dem in ihr vollzogenen Geheimnis keine Kenntnis hatten, nicht als ehrlos dastehen sollte. Und auch Jesus sollte in Joseph einen väterlichen Schutz, einen für seinen Unterhalt sorgenden Vater, einen Pflegevater, haben, so lange bis das Geheimnis der Menschwerdung in dem Schooß der Jungfrau nach dem Ratschluß Gottes offenbart werden sollte. Dies Amt war Joseph von Gott durch den Engel übertragen worden und er führte es getreu aus, war der besorgte Gemahl Marias und für Jesus ein guter Vater. Wie aber ein gutes, wohlerzogenes Kind seinen zweiten Vater einfach Vater nennt, obschon derselbe es nicht ist, und ihm willig den schuldigen Gehorsam leistet, so nannte Jesus den Joseph seinen Vater und war ihm wie seiner Mutter untertan. Gott war ihm aber sein himmlischer Vater.

So erweist sich denn alles, was man bisher gegen die Jungfraugeburt Jesu vorgebracht hat, als hinfällig. Kein einziger Grund, den Theologen oder Laien gegen sie ins Feld führten, sei es von geschichtlichem oder naturgeschichtlichem oder bibelkritischem Standpunkt aus, noch all die Gründe zusammengenommen, vermögen den Glauben an sie zu erschüttern. Wer aber in Jesus nur

einen Menschen, einen Menschen mit göttlicher Kraft ausgerüstet, den edelsten, besten vollkommensten Menschen und wie sonst noch die gebrauchten Ausdrücke lauten, erkennt, der steht, wer er immer sein mag, nicht auf dem Boden der Bibel, auch nicht auf dem Boden des christlichen Glaubens.

Um noch einmal zu dem oft erwähnten Pastor, Schriftsteller und Doktor der heiligen Theologie zurückzukommen, er konstatiert am Schluß seiner Abhandlung als seinen eignen Standpunkt, daß die Jungfrauengeburt nicht verworfen werden muß wegen irgendetwas, was die Wissenschaft ausgefunden hat. „If you deny it, you have no solid ground on which to stand," bemerkt er. Auch muß die Jungfrauengeburt nicht verworfen werden wegen irgend etwas, was die Geschichtsforschung entdeckt hat.

Aber er glaubt, daß der Glaube an die Jungfrauengeburt nicht wesentlich ist zur Erlösung; auch nicht wesentlich, ein Jünger Jesu zu sein, und auch nicht wesentlich, ein Glied einer christlichen Kirche zu sein; endlich ist dieser Glaube auch nicht wesentlich zum Glauben an die Menschwerdung. Dies letztere ist wohl das merkwürdigste Moment in seinen Festsetzungen. Er beruft sich hierbei auf das Urteil eines Dr. Charles Gore, nach seinem Urteil des größten lebenden Theologen in der englisch sprechenden Welt, und erklärt: Wenn die ersten Christen an die Fleischwerdung glaubten, aber nichts von der Jungfrauengeburt wußten, dann können sicher die Christen des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts an die Fleischwerdung glauben, obwohl sie nichts von der Art und Weise von Jesu Geburt wissen.

So kommt Jefferson zu dem Bekenntnis, daß er auch an die Jungfrauengeburt Jesu glaubt, aber nicht, weil Matthäus und Lukas dieselbe lehren; er basiert seinen Glauben daran, daß Jesus ist „the Holiest of the Mighty," wie auch Paulus seinen Glauben an die Gottheit Jesu auf Christi Heiligkeit und Macht gegründet habe.

Probleme der Religionspsychologie.*

Eine Erwiderung von Frl. L. Kugler, Danzig.

Ich zweifle nicht daran, daß die Religionspsychologie durchaus etwas Gutes ist, daß es ihr ernst ist um das Forschen nach Wahrheit. Durch exakte wissenschaftliche Arbeit, durch Experimentieren, genaues Beobachten mag sie zu Resultaten gelangen, die nicht allein interessant und brauchbar, sondern sogar von hohem praktischen Wert sein können. Sie mag auch der Theologie nicht zu unterschätzende Dienste leisten, besonders in pädagogischer Hinsicht, in Religionsunterricht und Seelsorge. Man läßt sich jedoch durch Erfolge so leicht blenden und wird verführt, von einer Sache mehr zu erwarten und mehr in sie hineinzulegen, als sie zu leisten vermag. Man sollte doch nicht vergessen: **die moderne Psychologie ist eine Naturwissenschaft** und hat als solche ihre Grenzen, über die sie nicht hinaus kann. Bei allen Naturwissenschaften gelangt man notwendig bis zu einem Punkt, wo sie versagen müssen. Hier ist ihr Feld zu Ende, hier tritt die Metaphysik in ihre Rechte, zu welcher ihnen der Schlüssel fehlt. Zu gern verlegt man sich dann aber aufs Vermuten und Raten und glaubt, damit sei der Sache ebenso gedient. Man wirft mit Wörtern und Begriffen um sich, unter denen sich wohl kaum irgendwer etwas Bestimmtes denken kann, wie zum Beispiel Urmaterie, Urenergie, Lebenskraft, Vitalismus usw. Dieser Unfug zieht mit Recht den Unwillen ernstdenkender Menschen auf sich.

Die Religionspsychologie freilich hat diese ihre Grenzen wohl erkannt, denn in ihrem Programm sagt sie, „sie wolle nur das Zustandekommen religiöser Vorstellungen, Gedankenverbindungen und Gefühle untersuchen und beschreiben. Ueber Wahrheit, Wert und Berechtigung der Religion vermöge sie nichts zu sagen." — Sie hat recht damit, denn das sind **metaphysische Fragen,** die garnicht in ihr Gebiet fallen. Wenn aber nun doch Anhänger dieser Richtung solche Fragen anschneiden, so ist das ein Mißgriff, den man nicht billigen kann, wenn man ihn auch versteht. Es ist klar, daß die Religionspsychologie die angesehene Stellung, die sie einmal errungen hat, nicht wieder verlieren möchte und bestrebt ist, sich womöglich noch mehr in den Vordergrund zu rücken.

Wenn aber die Theologie mit gläubigem Gemüt den Offenbarungen entgegensieht, die jene ihr verheißt, so beruht das, meiner Meinung nach, auf Unkenntnis der Sachlage; darauf nämlich, daß man nach wie vor die Psychologie als zur Metaphysik gehörig ansieht. Man kann eben nicht immer so schnell umlernen! In die-

*) Siehe „Theol. Magazin" Nr. 3, 1923. Diese „Erwiderung" ist durch Umstände stark verzögert worden. Ed.

sem Fall aber müßte man ihr ja dann auch die Berechtigung zur Teilnahme bei der Erörterung religiöser Fragen zuerkennen. Andernfalls wäre es allerdings nicht recht erklärlich, wie die Theologie sich einer Naturwissenschaft zuwendet und sie als Stützpunkt für ihr Gebäude verwerten möchte. Ich denke, die Naturwissenschaften waren bisher in der Theologie als empirisch und materialistisch verpönt.

Es scheint mir auch nicht richtig, daß die Religionspsychologen das Hauptmoment bei der Religion **im Gefühl** suchen. Religiöse Schwärmerei ist nicht Religion. Ich will damit nicht etwa der Vernunft das Wort reden. Diese hat ebensowenig wie das Gefühl etwas mit Religion zu tun: Religion ist keine abstrakte Gedankentätigkeit, auch nicht, wenn es sich um das Bilden religiöser Vorstellungen handelt. Das ist Sache der Religionsphilosophie. Die Vernunft als solche ist unfruchtbar und irrt umher und bleibt stets unbefriedigt. Religion dagegen wirkt gestaltend, bildend, von innen aus sich selber heraus. Sie verleiht zwar innere Befriedigung und Glück. Es kann einer aber die ganze Theologie, Religionsphilosophie und auch Ethik im Kopf haben und ist doch nicht religiös zu nennen. Denn nicht derjenige hat Religion, der seinen Standpunkt außerhalb der Welt nimmt und objektiv über Gott, Welt und Moral urteilt, sondern allein, wer mitten im Leben steht und sich selbst behauptet der Welt gegenüber. Nur Religion befähigt uns, recht mit dem Leben zu ringen; sie entscheidet für unsre **praktische Stellungnahme dem Leben gegenüber.**

Trifft diese Erklärungsweise nicht besonders auch auf das Christentum zu? Ich meine die reine wahre Lehre Jesu, wie sie besonders auch in den Synoptikern zum Ausdruck kommt und im Gegensatz steht zu den Verdrehungen, die sich später die Kirche, die alleinseligmachende, leistete; abgesehen auch von allem jüdisch-materialistischen Beiwerk, welches das Christentum mit sich herumschleppt — der ewige Jude in uns.

Die **Lehre Jesu** ist darum so selbstverständlich, schlicht und klar, weil sie durchaus **auf das Praktische gerichtet** ist. Da ist nichts von trockener, fruchtloser Gedankenspekulation, nichts von religiöser Schwärmerei und Gefühlsseligkeiten. Er sagt: Folge mir, verleugne dich selbst, liebe Freund und Feind; tue dies, vermeide jenes — so wirst du leben! — Der schlichteste Mann aus dem Volk versteht das alles ebenso wie der Gelehrte. Vielleicht versteht er es sogar besser als jener, weil er dem praktischen Leben noch näher steht, weil noch keine Vernünfteleien seinen Verstand trüben. Darum sagt auch Christus: Selig sind die geistlich Armen! — Menschen die schlichten Geistes sind.

Es ist deshalb auch gleichgültig für die Religion, ob die Philo-

sophie das Dasein Gottes zu beweisen oder es zu widerlegen sich vergeblich abmüht; ob Philosophie und hier auch Religionspsychologie über Berechtigung, Wert und Wahrheit der Religion streiten, ob sie heute mit Ja, morgen mit Nein entscheiden — was kann das der Religion schaden!

O, über die ängstlichen Gemüter, die da meinen, Sein oder Nichtsein hänge von solch fruchtlosem Schulstreit ab! Die Religion ist auf festerem Fundament gebaut. Dieser gewaltige, ehrwürdige Dom stürzt nicht gleich zusammen, wenn Mäuse an den Türen, vielleicht auch gar an den Altären nagen. Wenn aber das Dogmengebäude dieses oder jenes Theologen zusammenstürzt, so beweist das nur, daß es auf Sand gebaut war und darum dem Sturm der Zeiten nicht standhalten konnte: Mag es fallen — was schadet es der Religion. Solcher Stützen, solcher schwachen Geister kann sie wohl entbehren. „O, ihr Kleingläubigen," würde ihnen Jesus zurufen, „warum seid ihr so furchtsam!"

Die Religion wurzelt fester, sie wurzelt tief im Menschenherzen. Es kommen wohl für jeden Menschen Augenblicke im Leben, wo er sich über die Nichtigkeit des Daseins erheben möchte, wo er um Mut und Kraft ringt, den bitteren Kelch des Lebens und Leidens zu trinken. Dann sucht und findet er Erhebung und Stärkung im Gebet. So betet der evangelische Christ zum Vater in Christo, das katholische Mütterchen zu Maria, das indische zu Buddha. Sie alle hoffen auf Erhörung, selbst der Wilde, der vor seinem Steingötzen kniet. Der Götze freilich hilft ihm nicht; alle aber mögen Stärkung und Trost im Gebet finden, wenn auch verschieden nach Art und Maß. Doch wer erklärt uns den geheimnisvollen Vorgang, durch den dem Beter, wie aus dem eigenen erquickten Innern jene neue Kraft zuströmt? Und ob wir jenes auch schon selbst erlebten, suchen wir doch immer wieder etwas außer uns, was die Ursache sein möchte von dem, was uns innerlich widerfährt und bewegt — ja, was nur durch eine allgegenwärtige Macht vermittelt sein kann. Wir aber möchten es irgendwo in die Welt da draußen hin verlegen, damit wir es wahrnehmen können mit unserm Verstand und unsern Sinnen; sinnlich, bildlich meinen wir es uns erst machen zu müssen. So unvollkommen ist unser menschliches Erkenntnisvermögen, daß wir es garnicht anders zu fassen vermögen.

Auch unsre Sprache vermag dies alles nicht so recht klar auszudrücken, wenn nicht unsre Sprachweise es noch gar verdunkelt. So reden wir **von Gott,** grammatisch, **in der dritten Person;** als ob er nicht allzeit zugegen wäre und wir uns von ihm, wie von einem abwesenden, ungezwungen unterhalten könnten. Müßte er nicht mindestens stets in der zweiten Person stehen, wie wir sein

Ebenbild in jedem Nächsten zu entdecken haben; ja, müßte er nicht eigentlich die erste, **die allererste** sein?

Doch erinnern wir uns, wie Christus vor seinen Jüngern immer wieder mißverstanden wird. Als er zu ihnen vom Vater sprach, sagen sie: „Herr, zeige uns den Vater," und Jesus erwidert: „Ich und der Vater sind eins." Er weiß, daß sie ihn auch jetzt nicht verstehen. Freilich lernten sie sein späteres Wort schon durch den feindlichen Gegensatz etwas verstehen, nämlich jenes erhabene: „Mein Reich ist nicht von dieser Welt."

Es ist also nicht die Welt da draußen, die wir mit unsern Sinnen wahrnehmen, die Welt der Erscheinung, nach Kant, die Welt der Vorstellung, der Objekte, nach Schopenhauer, die Welt des Truges, der Schleier der Maja (indisch) — die empirisch reale Welt.

„Siehe, das Reich Gottes ist inwendig in euch," sagt unser Erlöser. „In deinem Innern ist ein Universum auch," viel wirklicher als alle Wirklichkeit, die uns Sinne und Verstand geben, die so leicht trügen, **ein Reich, uns unmittelbar bewußt.** Trotz ihrer schlichten und praktisch klaren Weise steht also Jesu Lehre doch in direktem Gegensatz zu allem, noch so poetischen, aber kraß sinnlichen Realismus. Ein Byron zum Beispiel, sensualistisch und pantheistisch gebannt, fällt aus seiner Festung, wenn er fragt:

Are not the mountains, waves and skies a part Of me and of my soul, as I of them?

Demnach trägt der Genannte in poetischem Schwung von der eigenen Seele und ihrem ewigen Reich das Gleichnis hinaus in das All und erkennt sich selbst wieder, nicht etwa im lieben Nächsten, sondern in der Außen- und Sinnenwelt der freien Natur.

Während nun **Christi Lehre durchaus idealistisch** ist, finden wir das Christentum unsrer Tage derart von jüdischem Materialismus durchsetzt und entstellt, daß man seinen Ursprung kaum mehr erkennt und fast versucht ist, es als eine jüdische, verweltlichte Sekte anzusprechen. Wie selten sind diejenigen, die dem Sohn Gottes die Ehre geben, die ihm unbedingt gebührt, die nämlich seine Worte für buchstäbliche ewige Wahrheit eben durch dementsprechendes Befolgen anerkennen? Das halbgläubige und ungläubige Modechristentum von heute ist es, das die tiefer Denkenden von der Lehre Christi abschreckt und verscheucht.

Das Verhalten und Leben dieser Namenschristen ist es, was doch den wenigen aufrichtigen gegenüber, den Außenstehenden viel lauter gepredigt und **Jesu Lehre** in ihren Augen gar verächtlich erscheinen läßt; seine Lehre, die doch in Wahrheit **das Tiefste und Erhabenste** ist, was je Menschengeist bewegt hat, bewegt eben dazu, im Glauben mit Jesu Person in ewige Verbindung zu treten.

Christus lehrte den **unendlichen Wert der Menschenseele,** einen Wert, der über alle Maße geschaffener Werte hinausgeht. Von dieser Seele sagt er: „Was hülfe es dem Menschen, so er die ganze Welt gewönne und nähme doch Schaden an seiner Seele, oder was kann der Mensch geben, damit er seine Seele wieder löse?“ Wenn er also sagt, „das Reich Gottes ist in euch,“ so meint er doch zweifellos, in ihr, in der Seele. Ist sie aber **Trägerin des Reiches Gottes,** so ist sie doch vor allem auch Subjekt und Objekt der Religion. Welchen Wert auch solche derselben zumessen, die man schwerlich tief religiös nennen dürfte, beweist ein Ausspruch Goethes, den wir hier noch zum Schluß anführen. Er sagt: Die Religion ist ein Gefühl der Sicherheit und des Vertrauens auf ein unerforschliches Wesen in uns.

EDITORIALS

OUR APPROACH TO RELIGION SHOULD IT BE THEOLOGICAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL?

Recently we had the unusual privilege to hear *H. E. Fosdick,* the pastor of Park Avenue Baptist Church, of New York City. He delivered a sermon at the ordination of a young man who had been his assistant in pastoral work and his pupil (at Union Theol. Seminary) for two years. The mere announcement of his coming worked wonders. Admission was by ticket, and over 2,000 tickets were given out, so it was said.

The speaker set out by saying there was quite a good deal of disturbance about religion in the land; many felt that religion had to be saved. It was somewhat like a great reservoir of water that had at one time been a source of refreshment and life to many, but now it had become leaky and might burst at any time: it had changed to a source of anxiety. In his opinion the excitement was entirely unnecessary. *Instead of saving religion,* it was much more important to *get a religion that saves us.* The first thing such a religion would do would be a liberating process: Instead of the gratification of the lower self it would offer a man a higher cause to give himself to.

He told us, young students often come to him confessing that they have lost their religion. He soon convinces them that the case is not so bad at all. They still have ideals they want to pursue; causes they want to affiliate themselves with. Why, he says to them, you have not lost your religion; you are in the service of the ideal. Don't you see that that is the same as being religious? Here he related the story of a doctor who had gone to Africa to combat the yellow fever, but on arriving there he found that the serum that elsewhere had been successful failed there. So he tried to find a better one, making experiments on his own blood. He contracted the fever himself, died a victim of his love of suffering humanity and was buried in New York the week before. Was not the self-sacrifice of this heroic man the very highest manifestation of the religious spirit?

So, he concluded, was the student's quest of ideals religious in itself and needed only stimulation to flower out in perfect form. We did not quite agree with the eloquent speaker. We certainly also admired that doctor, but we had heard of people trying to find the Northpole and enduring untold miseries in the attempt; we had

heard of others who lost their lives in crossing the Atlantic, getting the praises of mankind for their daring in the service of flying art; of millions of soldiers who had brought the supreme sacrifice on the altar of patriotism. All these men had ideals and thought their lives cheap. They made our hearts beat higher, but we don't see what religion had to do with it. To us religion relates man to God; and not only here but throughout the whole discourse we did not see *how* and *where God came in.*

Doubtless F. was trying the psychological approach. His way is to take men as they are and to build on the mental attitudes and inner experiences of his subjects. He does not want to impose any kind of "theology" on them: the miracles, or the divine nature of Christ, or the atonement, or the fall of Adam. But he never told us how he bridges the gulf from the mere ideal to the living God. He did not even mention the name of Jesus Christ. He said himself that he had left Jesus out on purpose; that he had intentionally spoken only in modern terms. Imagine, at an ordination service of a Christian minister! No wonder he never succeeded in bringing God in; that he never mentioned sin or salvation.

The second characteristic of a religion that saves us was its power to lay hold on us. A weak, an intermittant, a traditional, a lukewarm religion can do but little. Only the men in whom it is an absorbing passion will experience its full power. True enough, but how do we reach that point or come approximately nearer to it?

The last attribute of a saving religion is its ever present influence in the daily life. This feature was admirably described. Religion must show its pragmatic value in the school of life. Christian Science and New Thought have an incredible metaphysics but they teach their disciples to draw on the present power of the divine spirit; they get results. The churches of the old kind have neglected this and so other cults have pushed ahead of them. We must learn a lesson from them. God is here, his presence is available for us. Serenity, poise of soul, integration of personality can be won here. In this connection F. made the strange statement, "Less and less do I want God as a matter of faith, but more and more do I need and want him as a matter of fact." As though we could get assured of the reality of God in any other way than by the way of faith!

It will be admitted that the features which F. mentioned are indeed vital to a live religion, but he promised to tell us *how we get* that kind of religion—and he did not keep his promise. To our mind, he should have led those students from their personal and circumscribed ideals to the universal and all-embracing one, the Kingdom of God. Then he would have to bring in Jesus Christ.

the highest source of inspiration and the unmatched example of ethical and spiritual striving, and, at the same time, the guarantee of the ultimate victory of the true idealist. Going still further, he would have had to show that the Christian religion is par excellence a *redeemer-religion,* that Christ is not only an inspiring example but a redeemer, a saviour. No doubt that would have brought in "theological" elements, but it is utterly impossible to omit such. The very nature of the psychological approach would demand it, for the subjects of our pastoral care have grown up in the Christian faith or, at least, under its influence. The study of natural science may have put stumbling blocks in their way, but still they know science can't take the place of religion; they know the Christian religion is there and that there is no other religion in sight that could take its place. All this belongs to their intellectual and moral equipment; so we have to start from it and try to clear a way for the real Christ.

F. used a striking illustration to show the different kinds of approach by men of different schools. He put it as follows: A man is stalled with his automobile on the highway, he has no gas. Along comes the fundamentalist and tells him: "A mile from here is a filling station where you can replenish your tank: believe it and you will be saved." An old-fashioned Liberal comes along, views the situation and says: "I think there is a filling station not far from here, at least it is very likely. Act *as though* there was one and you will be saved."

Finally comes the modern man. He goes into the car examines it carefully, finds it is not empty at all and says: There is quite a good bit of gas left; go ahead on your own power and soon you'll find a station where you can get a new supply."

F. is this modern teacher. He finds in man enough of goodness and idealism to be hopeful about him. All he needs is to have his ethics strengthened and his mind informed. How this is to be done he did not tell us.

We, on the other hand, believe that there is little hope for a man before he has a sense of moral and spiritual need, is looking for divine help. We are sure this help comes to him only through Christ, the Saviour. We also use the psychological approach, we start from a man's individual experience. From there, however, we make as brief and direct a road to Christ as possible; and we still believe that the message of the crucified and risen Christ that started the church on its world-conquering career, is the source of its ever renewed life, and not the ethical teachings of the Sermon on the Mount.

CORPORATE COMMUNIONS

In this year's "Reports" to the District Conferences the Brotherhood had a recommendation that "Retreats" for men should be introduced, i. e., gatherings of Brotherhood men, held, preferably, far from the noise of the cities, at which "devotional subjects, such as prayer, worship, meditation, bible study, closer fellowship with God, the power of the Holy Spirit, soul-winning might be treated and intercession practised. The celebration of the Lord's Supper should be a part of such retreats." This latter clause about the Lord's Supper provoked a good deal of discussion at our Conference (Ohio). It was pointed out that the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the Brotherhood men only had a tendency to counteract one of the very purposes for which the Sacrament was instituted. The Lord's Supper stresses the fact that the church of Christ is one ("one body, with many members"). Now if we celebrate communion by one organization only, we introduce a divisive element. Pretty soon the women would want a communion for themselves; then the Young People's League, the Missionary Society, etc. Such observances, instead of uniting the church, would split it up into separate units. Instead of unification, segregation and disruption would be the consequence. In reply to this, others stated that it was not the idea at all that from such communions for particular organizations the rest of the congregation should be excluded. They might all come, every one was welcome; only, a more especial appeal was to be made to the members of that specific body. It seemed that most speakers were satisfied with that explanation. No one objected to corporate communion as such, so long as they were open to everybody else.

This writer takes a different position. He has never announced a communion for a separate organization. He has never invited the Brotherhood or the Ladies' Aid to come to the Lord's table in a body—and he never expects to. We may invite—and do invite—whole organizations to the church services; we may go out into the by-ways and lanes of the city with a general invitation, and even urge them to come in. Not so with the Lord's Supper. Here only those are invited who are penitent, who have faith in Christ and truly desire to lead a Christian life. A person may belong to a Brotherhood or Ladies' Aid and yet wholly lack these qualifications. If I invite them to come to the Lord's table because they are members of a certain body they come for that reason and the spiritual requirements are apt to be lost sight of.

It may be objected that we extend a general invitation to the Lord's Supper at Easter time, and that among the communicants there will be many who are not really prepared, and come only

because it's Easter. That is no doubt true, but in giving out our invitation we should not forget to mention the spiritual requirements expected of those who want to come. If we do that, we are not responsible for those who come only as a matter of custom. If, however, we invite organizations to come as a whole, we emphasize the mere fact of outward affiliation and obscure the need of spiritual discernment. The religious life is always in danger of becoming conventional. A dead formality takes the place of vital religion. We know how our Lord fought against this very thing; we know how the Reformers had the same task on their hands. It is true our own time does not take much stock in the externals of religion. Still, in certain quarters there is a revival of the belief in the efficacy of outward religious practices, in the magic power of the sacraments (see only the powerful Anglo-Catholic movement in the Episcopal Church). We ourselves are far from Catholicizing tendencies. Yet we do well to remember that the Lord's Supper works only harm when treated as an opus operatum; that, as Paul says, those who discern not the body of Christ eat and drink unto themselves a judgment. Who would want to be responsible for such a disastrous experience!

Toleranz.

„Toleranz ist das Hauptkennzeichen einer wahren Kirche. Sie fußt auf christlicher Liebe." So heißt es in einem Artikel in der „Christlichen Welt" (vom 5. Mai dieses Jahres). In diesem Artikel werden sogenannte „Friedhofskandale" besprochen, die sich zuzeiten im alten Vaterland noch ereignen. Zum Beispiel beschließt eine Kirchengemeinde in Württemberg, daß „solchen, die aus der Landeskirche austreten und sich einer Sekte anschließen, im Todesfall die Beerdigung auf dem Gemeindekirchhof **in der Reihe der Gräber** unter allen Umständen verweigert sei." Sie sollen also irgendwie in einer Ecke, ähnlich wie Selbstmörder, beerdigt werden.

Intoleranz in diesem Sinn erscheint uns freilich eine mittelalterliche Rückständigkeit. Wenn wir von Toleranz oder Intoleranz reden, so denken wir an eine solche in Glaubenssachen. Nicht so wohl an die allgemeine Religionsfreiheit, wie solche, von den Täufern zuerst beansprucht, von Roger Williams tatsächlich in Rhode Island eingeführt worden ist, und durch die „Aufklärungs"-Bewegung sich in der protestantischen Welt durchgesetzt hat. Heutzutage spitzt sich die Forderung der Toleranz zu in dem Verlangen nach **Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen in derselben Kirche.** Die „Bekenntnisse" der Kirche sollen nicht als „Lehrgesetze" benutzt werden. Die Pastoren und insonderheit die akademischen Lehrer, auch wenn sie auf die Symbole der Kirche verpflichtet werden, sollen damit

nicht an alle Einzelheiten gebunden sein. Ihre Unterschrift soll mehr nur eine allgemeine Zustimmung zu dem Wesentlichen des Bekenntnisses sein. Da sie zu einer andern Zeit, zu den Menschen unsrer Tage reden, so müssen sie in der Sprache und in den Denkformen des modernen Menschen sich ausdrücken.

Nur ganz wenige Kirchen halten an der Verbalinspiration fest; es folgt daraus, daß die Autorität der Bibel sich nicht auf alle Gebiete des menschlichen Lebens gleichermaßen erstreckt. Sie ist eine Urkunde der göttlichen Selbstoffenbarung, aber kein naturwissenschaftliches Textbuch. Sie hindert den Geologen, den Anthropologen nicht in seinen Forschungen. Die Wahrheit kann nur Eine sein, darum können Glaube und Wissenschaft im letzten Grund nicht zu entgegengesetzten Resultaten kommen. Freilich sagt die Bibel, der Mensch ist als Mensch geschaffen und das Tier als Tier, während die Naturwissenschaft die Evolution des Höheren aus dem Niederen, eine Abfolge aus dem Anorganischen ins Organische und aus dem Tierischen ins Menschliche behauptet. Im Einzelnen mag man sich da zu einem „Non liquet" entschließen, doch bleibt uns der Glaube an den Schöpfer unbestritten, was immer die Entwicklung des Lebens gewesen sein mag.

Doch naturgemäß, Forschung und Stellungnahme machen nicht halt bei diesen Fragen der Inspiration und bei dem Verhältnis von Naturwissenschaft und Bibelwort. Der Gottes- und Menschensohn steht im Mittelpunkt der Schrift, und die Frage ist heute so dringend wie je: Was dünket dich um **Christum?** Es genügt uns nicht, wenn gesagt wird, Christ sein heiße christlich leben, den Geist Christi haben. Es genügt uns nicht, in Christo bloß den Anreger und das Vorbild christlichen Lebens zu sehen, denjenigen, der den Gottesglauben und die Menschenliebe urbildlich uns vorgelebt hat und uns so in seine Nachfolge hineinzieht. Auf Grund der Schrift und der Erfahrung der ersten Christenheit sehen wir in ihm den **Bringer des Heils, den Mittler des neuen Bundes,** welcher Bund in seiner Selbsthingabe seine **Begründung** und **sein Siegel** findet. Den Geist Christi haben, leben wie er gelebt, ist freilich unser Ideal; wir sind aber fern von diesem Ziel, auch beim besten Leben. Wer könnte also auf seine unvollkommene Nachfolge **Gewißheit des Heils** gründen? Solche Gewißheit bringt nur der Glaube an ihn und sein Wort.

Gegen eine Lehre, die in Christo weniger sieht, können wir keine Toleranz üben. Es mag wahr sein, daß man in Christo den Heilsbringer sehen kann, ohne an seine Jungfrauengeburt zu glauben. Aber in der Regel machen diejenigen, welche diese leugnen oder bezweifeln, auch Abstriche an seiner Heilsbedeutung.

Von zwei Seiten erfährt die christliche Glaubenslehre heutzutage eine geringschätzige Behandlung: von den Soziologen und

von denen, die in starke Abhängigkeit von der Naturwissenschaft geraten sind. Die ersten legen allen Nachdruck auf die ethische Auswirkung des christlichen Geistes. In den verschiedensten Schattierungen sind sie sich darin eins, daß wir für das soziale Evangelium eine neue Theologie brauchen, und diese neue Theologie reduziert wesentliche Stücke des christlichen Glaubens.

Die Naturwissenschaftler erhoffen von der Erforschung der uns umgebenden Welt neues Licht über den ersten Artikel, das Wesen Gottes, seine Vorsehung, seine Weltregierung. Ihnen ist die Bibel in diesen Stücken keine autoritative Quelle mehr. Auch Jesus ist ihnen bloß ein Vorbild sittlichen Wandels. Was er von Gott, seinem Wesen und Walten, sagt, bedarf der Nachprüfung und Korrektur seitens der wissenschaftlichen Weltbetrachtung. (Siehe „Current Christian Thinking" von G. B. Smith, Juliheft des „Theologischen Magazins," Seite 318 ff., und „Religious Thought in the last Quarter Century" von demselben, Septemberheft des „Theologischen Magazins," Seite 397 ff.)

In allen Kirchen, von den altorthodoxen abgesehen, nehmen wir den Kampf der alten und neuen Meinungen wahr. Ebenso ist das Bestreben allgemein, die Kirchen vor zu großen Erschütterungen durch Maßhalten auf beiden Seiten zu bewahren; mit den Presbyterianern zu sprechen: eine „tolerationist attitude" einzunehmen. Man fühlt, daß die praktischen Aufgaben so groß und schwer sind, daß man nicht die Kräfte durch inneren dogmatischen Streit zersplittern darf. Das ist eine sehr lobenswerte Stellung; nur geht es nicht an, Lebensinteressen des Glaubens dem Opportunismus zum Opfer zu bringen.

Die Hin-nach-Rom-Bewegung in der Episkopalkirche.

In den Einigungsbewegungen der christlichen Kirchen unsrer Zeit haben die Episkopalen immer behauptet, daß ihrer Kirche die naturgemäße Mittlerrolle zufalle. Sie habe in ihrer Verfassung und ihrem Kultus sowohl katholische als protestantische Elemente, berühre sich also mit den Kirchen diesseits und jenseits der Reformation. Vielleicht könne man sagen, daß ihr von der Vorsehung die Aufgabe gestellt sei, die beklagenswerte Trennung der Glieder des Leibes Christi durch Anerkennung des beiderseitig Guten zu heilen. So ging denn auch die Einladung zu der Konferenz von Lausanne, die „on Faith and Order" beraten sollte, von ihr aus.

Inzwischen mag diese optimistische Auffassung von dem besondern Beruf der Episkopalkirche wohl etwas brüchig geworden sein. Die Einladung nach Lausanne ging an alle Kirchen aus. Die

Römisch-Katholischen schlugen rundweg ab. Die Griechisch-Katholischen waren freilich da, aber die Bedingungen, die sie für eine tatsächliche Einigung stellten, waren so hyperorthodox und mittelalterlich rückständig, daß wohl alle Protestanten sich der tiefen Kluft bewußt werden mußten. Mit der Einigung von Protestantismus und Katholizismus hat es also noch gute Wege.

Zur Einigung aber der protestantischen Kirchen allein fehlt es der Episkopalkirche an allem. Nicht nur wegen der apostolischen Sukzession und der Stellung ihres Episkopats. Das Haupthindernis ist das „Anglo-Catholic Movement," die Bewegung, die sich an Rom orientiert und nach Rom hinneigt. Diese Bewegung ist sehr stark in England, aber auch in unserm Land recht bedeutend. In England sollen 70 Prozent des Klerus dafür sein, bei uns etwa 40 Prozent. Und was den Anglo-Katholiken noch an Zahl abgeht, ersetzen sie durch Kühnheit und Geschlossenheit ihres Vorgehens. Diese Leute sehen sich nicht als Protestanten an. Die Reformation ist ihnen die beklagenswerte Ursache der Zersplitterung des Leibes Christi. Ihre Liebe und ihr Streben gehört den katholischen Charakterzügen der Kirche. Eine pomphafte Kultussymbolik und vor allem eine Hochspannung des sakramentalen Begriffes in dem kirchlichen Betrieb rücken sie in unmittelbare Nähe des Romanismus.

Die Priester sind die eigentlichen Rufer im Streit. Das Laienelement Englands wünscht keine Verpäpstlichung. Alle diese romanisierenden Korruptionen haben sich in die Kirche eingeschlichen, trotzdem das offizielle „Book of Common Prayer" sie nicht gestattet. Um diesem gesetzlosen Zustand ein Ende zu machen und zugleich den Anglo-Katholiken entgegenzukommen, haben die Bischöfe zweimal eine Revision des Gebetsbuches beim Parlament beantragt und sind zweimal abgewiesen worden. Das letzte Mal wurde die Annahme des Entwurfs hauptsächlich verweigert wegen des vorgeschlagenen Passus über die **Reservation** des Sakraments. Die „Church of England" glaubt an die Realpräsenz des Leibes Christi. Wenn die Elemente konsekriert sind, ist Christus wirklich da und muß angebetet werden. Die übergebliebenen Reste des Abendmahls (oder der „Messe" sollten nach dem Entwurf **reserviert** werden, aber als solche nicht angebetet, denn der Leib Christi ist nicht mehr gegenwärtig. Werden sie aber nachher etwa zur Krankenkommunion gebraucht, so vereinigt sich Christus wieder mit den Elementen (dynamisch, der Kraft nach).

Die Laien des Parlaments konnten weder die Logik dieser Messentheorie verstehen, noch wünschten sie solche magische Wandlungsmacht dem Priester zu verleihen, noch die (schließliche) Anbetung der Hostie zu gestatten.

So bleibt es also bei dem alten gesetzlosen Zustand. Die Prie-

ſter werden ſich dadurch nicht von ihren katholiſierenden Neigungen abhalten laſſen, und die Biſchöfe ſind meiſt auf ihrer Seite. Daß ſich das Laienelement alle dieſe Dinge gefallen läßt, mag teils auf Gleichgültigkeit beruhen, teils auf Abneigung gegen religiöſe Streitigkeiten, teils auch vielleicht auf der Sympathie des weiblichen Teiles der Bevölkerung.

Es ſteht ſchlimm, wie wir ſehen, um den Proteſtantismus der Kirche Englands und eines großen Teiles der amerikaniſchen Epiſkopalkirche. Jedenfalls, wenn die Epiſkopalen wie bisher dem Romanismus das Feld freigeben, ſo iſt es mit ihrer Mittlerrolle in den Einigungsbeſtrebungen Matthäi am letzten.

The Christian World

PROHIBITION: WHERE METHODISM STANDS

This declaration was unanimously adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Kansas City, Mo., May, 1928

Prohibition is the fixed policy of the United States of America. The Eighteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution incorporated in the basic law of a great nation the underlying convictions of its people.

Liquor Traffic an Outlaw

The American nation is no longer in partnership with the liquor traffic. It has deprived that traffic of the sanction of law and the protection of government. That traffic is an outlaw, which no longer has standing as a lawful institution in the statutes and the courts of the nation. This alone constitutes one of the greatest victories for civic righteousness recorded in modern times.

This achievement represents the ripened conviction and the deliberate judgment of the American people after more than a hundred and fifty years of regulations, license, repression, taxation, government sale and attempted control, and every other method devised for the purpose of dealing with this nefarious habit and traffic.

The Results of Prohibition

The social, economic and moral benefits of this law have been amply demonstrated in increased industrial efficiency, a larger degree of safety on the highways and in the factories, unmatched productivity, unparalleled savings, unequaled public health records, a remarkable decrease in the national death rate and unprecedented evidences of social and moral well being.

The conservation of the higher values of manhood, reduced sorrows of womanhood and mitigated wrongs of childhood, eloquently proclaim the success of prohibition as a sound policy of government, which has made it "easier for men to do right and more difficult for men to do wrong."

Judged by all the evidence in the case of prohibition with enforcement at its worst is shown to be better than the legally sanctioned beverage alcohol with regulations at its best.

Orderly Government Challenged

The forces of greed, avarice, and appetite have challenged the authority of law, defied government, held up to contempt the fundamental principles of righteousness, and have flouted the expressed and properly recorded will of the American people.

In the face of such defiance we insist upon a more aggressive, unyielding and definite campaign of agitation, organization and education in the interest o our common objective. Total abstinence must be stressed; the vital importance of law observance as basic to ade-

quate law enforcement must be emphasized; there must be a revival of scientific temperance instruction in the public schools, the pulpit, the church school, the young people's societies and all other agencies of the Church must take an aggressive and constructive course of action. We speedily must get to the people the whole truth about the nature and effects of beverage alcohol; the truth about the real character and activities of the local, national and international liquor traffic; the truth about all methods tried or schemes proposed for the solution of the problem, and the truth about prohibition.

Issue Definite and Clear.

We are not deceived by cunningly devised plans of the enemies of sobriety and prohibition to discount the work already accomplished. We demand clear and definite declarations on the part of candidates and parties appealing to our constituency for their suffrage.

We serve notice on all concerned that our attitude on this vital question is resolute and irreversible; that we will not be lulled into inactivity by evasive promises, indecisive declarations; that we will not support uncertain candidates for State and National legislative and administrative offices, and that we will not willingly tolerate in position of responsibility those who do not sustain the law and the principle of righteousness which the law represents.

A World Wide Problem

The beverage alcohol evil presents a world problem, which demands international cooperation. Permanency of prohibition in America requires international action, while the success of a world movement for sobriety depends upon the success of prohibition here. Prohibition is not safe anywhere until it has become the settled policy of government everywhere. We, therefore, pledge to our brothers in other countries our fullest possible cooperation in the struggle against the international traffic which now seeks not only to stem the tide of temperance advance in other lands, but to undermine and nullify prohibition in America.

Organized Activities

We commend and endorse the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in its national and international leadership among women; the Anti-Saloon League of America, our approved agency for cooperation with members of other churches and with temperance organizations in America for united effort against the common foe; and the World League Against Alcoholism in which are federated the principal anti-liquor organizations in the several countries for international interdenominational effort for temperance reform.

Especially do we urge upon our people everywhere increasingly to support and cooperate with Methodism's own agency in the field of moral reform. The Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals, with a record in the past of which we are justly proud, is planning even a greater program for the future, to which our people everywhere should rally with increased enthusiasm and confidence throughout the whole Church.

To all temperance and prohibition agencies and movements which are effectively and aggressively pressing for temperance and moral reform in America and abroad, we appeal for renewed activity and cooperative effort to the end that the moral forces of the nations shall speedily find the way to a world redeemed from the curse of beverage alcohol.

No Turning Back

This moral conflict must be prosecuted to final victory. We stop at no half-way station. We summon the enlightened public opinion and quickened public conscience of the nation and the world.

We will not countenance anarchy under a banner of personal liberty and social license; and we support the right of a free people to govern themselves. In this stretgic hour in the progress of this great reform there must be no minor note, no discordant sound, no equivocal stand.

We face the issue before us with confidence and determination. We believe in the common sense of the American people. We believe in the triumph of right. We believe in the hand of God in our national affairs.

We will not be stampeded; we will not retract; we will not cease to speak by tongue and pen and vote; we will not turn back; we have enlisted for the duration of the conflict, which will end only in the complete extermination of the beverage alcohol habit and traffic.

The Wet "World" Rebukes a Bishop

The New York World allows its wetness to befog its usually clear lenses. Otherwise how account for this fierce attack on Bishop James Cannon, Jr., for his activity at Houston in connection with the prohibition plank in the Democratic platform? The World says:

"Mr. James Cannon as a private citizen has a perfect right to express approval or disapproval of the Prohibition plank. But 'Bishop Cannon of the Methodist Church' has no place in politics and should be kept out of them. When the Texas Governor quotes the Bishop's approval—when, as The World's Houston dispatch puts it, he cites the Bishop, Carter Glass and Josephus Daniels and announces 'that because of them he would accept the majority plank'—then we see a church officer interfering with government in an entirely improper way. Mr. Cannon's opinion is of importance only because he claims to represent the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. When his approval or disapproval sways men at Houston it is because of an implied threat of the use of Methodist Church strength. He and Gov. Moody and their like are putting the Methodist Church into government, and every right-minded American should resent the attempt.

"What if some delegate had arisen at Houston and said that upon consulting the American Cardinals on this or that plank he had received a 'nihil obstat'? Yet in essence how much does Gov. Moody's statement differ from this? When any sect, Catholic or Jewish, Presbyterian or Methodist, interferes in politics, for the sake alike of a healthy religion

and a healthy state the functionaries responsible deserve a prompt and memorable rebuke."

Bishop Cannon, if we have the facts correctly, was at Houston as a member of the headquarters committee of the Anti-Saloon League, and not as a bishop. That would seem to make a difference which the World was bound in honesty to respect. Furthermore, the parallel of Methodist Bishop and Roman Cardinal is totally false. The Cardinal is a prince of a foreign church. He holds his commission from an alien power. The interference of a Roman Cardinal at Houston or Kansas City would have ruined the cause of his plank or his candidate, as the World knows perfectly well. We are not so sure that an American church made up of American citizens and taking no orders from an alien source, would not be justified in cases where moral principles are involved, in seeking a hearing in party conventions. In fact, this is precisely what the Methodist Episcopal Church did in both conventions, though its judgment was against placing any bishop upon these deputations. The World would better reserve its hysterics for a more serious situation, for, unless all signs fail, the nomination of an out-and-out liquor man for the presidency has stirred the dry churches as no other political issue has stirred them in a generation. The rough treatment which the World gives to Bishop Cannon may seem to it to be "a prompt and memorable rebuke," but if we mistake not, it will not be so taken by him or the millions of his fellow churchmen, mostly Southern Methodists, and mostly of his mind as to platform and candidates. Methodists are so accustomed to receiving rebukes from wet newspapers that they thrive under such treatment.

"They Feared the People"

We do not compare the issues before the recent Republican and Democratic national conventions with those dealt with by the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem in the year 29, except, that in both instances the representatives of authority heeded the demands of the people. Neither great political party in the United States was persuaded by the clamors of the wets to go to the polls with a plank in its platform promising even a modification of the Volstead Act, let alone a resubmission of the Eighteenth Amendment to the voters. Both conventions were given a chance. At Kansas City Dr. Butler, president of a great university, and at Houston, Mr. Ritchie, governor of a great state, advocated opening the question. The proposal of both was denied.

To as great a degree as can possibly occur in American political life, the quadrennial conventions that nominate candidates for the presidency reflect the will of the populace. This is truer today than ever in the past, because not only the press but the radio put the party into direct touch with current opinion. There is also a reasonable certainty that both nominating conventions this year were "unbossed and unbought." Everybody knows that the people are aroused and that next November's ballot boxes will come nearer containing a competent expression of the views of the individual Americans of both sexes than

at any election in the last hundred years. The politicians evidently felt that they must so frame their platform on the use of alcohol in beverages as to meet the wishes of the voters. Their declarations favoring enforcement of the existent law and the Eighteenth Amendment can be explained in no other way.

It is because conventions to nominate candidates for the presidency are guided in their decisions as to the platform by what they think the people want that this year's platform pronouncements on alcoholic beverages are of primary importance. President Butler and Governor Ritchie claimed that the majority of the voters "are wet." Beyond doubt, they spoke for a certain portion of the people. Borah and Carter Glass say the majority of the voters "are dry." They based their claim on resolutions passed by churches and women's societies, by the complexion of Congress and legislatures and by expressions of opinion gotten in circles to whom the big secular dailies and the radicals pay little attention. It is generally assumed that the ardent wets will vote. Unless those for whom Borah and Carter Glass spoke actually deposit their ballots next November, and prior to election day give unmistakable approval of the platform's plain meaning, laws lifting the ban on liquor drinking will be passed.

The American people are patient with transgressors of principle, and easy going. But in no instance in their history have they surrendered high moral ideals to profiteers and exploiters of the poor and the week. It is a "paramount duty" of the defenders of sobriety and efficiency to back up with voice and vote the majority of delegates to the Kansas City and Houston conventions. If insincerity or ambiguity in a platform exists, its proponents should be rebuked at the polls.

—*The Lutheran.*

Noguchi a Martyr to Medical Research

By Watson Davis

Managing Editor, *Science Service*, Washington

Without the blare of bugles and the blaze of flags, in the quiet stillness of laboratories, there are those who died not alone for their country but for humanity. The list of scientific martyrs is long and the gifts of their sacrifices have been many. In the records there is now inscribed the name of Dr. Hideyo Noguchi.

Japanese by race, scientist by profession, he was a part of an American effort to conquer a disease that constitutes a menace to the civilization of at least three continents. He did his last work in Africa, making a further attack upon yellow fever which, through his efforts and those of his colleague, had practically been banished from the Americas, once its stronghold. The world was Noguchi's country. Just a year ago before he took up the fight against *Leptospira*, the causative organism of yellow fever which he exposed to the world, he discovered the cause of trachoma, the eye disease that blinds so many of the American Indians. Telling attacks upon syphilis and smallpox were made by Noguchi and he also contributed to the knowledge of many other diseases.

It may take months or years for the medical world to estimate the importance and value of the most recent researches of Noguchi. When he was stricken with the disease he insisted that samples of his own blood be taken from his body for inoculation of monkeys. His associates are carrying on with the cultures that he left. When the tests are completed it may be that it will be possible to settle definitely the ancient controversy as to whether there are one or two forms of the dread "yellow jack"—one American, the other African. Then it will be possible, perhaps, to lay the blame for the origin of yellow fever upon Africa, whence the disease was carried to America by the slave trade.

During work on yellow fever in South America in 1918 Noguchi isolated a germ believed to be the cause of yellow fever. From it he developed a preevntive vaccine and a serum that proved fairly efficacious if used within two or three days after the onset of the disease. Campaigns against the deadly stegomyia mosquito, carrier of the disease, practically stamped out the infection in the Western Hemisphere, but it continued to be a serious menace in West Africa. It is important that the disease be suppressed in Western Africa before a transcontinental railway is opened. Otherwise the yellow fever would be carried not only to the east of the African continent, but also to teeming Oriental countries in which the stegomyia, the yellow fever mosquito, thrives. Health authorities quail at what might happen if the infection spread to this region. Once the mosquitos of India and Southern China were infected the yellow fever would take great toll among the unsanitary homes of those countries.

With such a prospect it is understandable that a determined effort is being made to smother the disease in its last stronghold. The International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation established the laboratory in which Noguchi was working at Lagos, Nigeria. A staff, highly trained, has been at work on the problem for several years. In South America Noguchi was able to transfer the disease to monkeys or even guinea pigs, but workers in Africa for a long period found it impossible to inoculate any animals, a condition that indicated that the disease is different in the Eastern and Western Hemisphere, despite the similarity of the outward aspects of the disease on both sides of the South Atlantic. Finally, however, monkeys of the variety known as *Macacus rhesus* were infected with typical African yellow fever. Instrumental in this achievement was Dr. Adrian Stokes, a British investigator, at Lagos laboratory, who gave his life as a result of the researches. Like Noguchi he succumbed to the disease with which he worked. But his work constituted an important step, since it did away with the necessity in studying the African form for volunteer human victims, such as were called for by the United States Army Commission in Havana in 1900. At the same time the workers were unable to find the causative Leptospira in the patients' blood. It almost seemed as if the two diseases had different origins.

Since Dr. Noguchi was generally conceded to know more about this particular group of germs than any other living person, he un-

dertook the African trip last Fall to see if he could separate the two diseases. Perhaps his skillful crippled hands, famous throughout the realm of bacteriology for their technique with test tube and microscope, could demonstrate *Leptospira icteroides* where others had failed, or even show an entirely different cause. While at work he contracted the disease and died. From the evidence now at hand authorities at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research are inclined to believe that the work he left indicates that there are two distinct forms of the disease.

As these lines are being written the news comes that Dr. William Alexander Young, Director of Medical Research, died from yellow fever at Accra, on the Gold Coast, on May 30. He was assistant to Dr. Noguchi in investigating the disease which has now been fatal to three important research workers.—*Current History.*

Science Misapplied—Engineers and War

From The Manchester Guardian Weekly, June 8.

Representative engineers from all parts of the British Commonwealth and from many foreign countries have been in London this week attending the centenary celebrations of the Institution of Civil Engineers—incorporated by royal charter June 3, 1928.

The most interesting event was the delivery of the James Forrest lecture on "A century of inventions" by Sir Alfred Ewing, one of the most distinguished of living engineers, who during the war was in charge of the department of the Admiralty dealing with enemy cipher. His survey of a hundred years of scientific progress concluded with a discussion of the question: What is left for the future engineer to do?

"Can," he asked, "the recent astounding pace of discovery and invention be maintained? Or does a time approach when engineers will sit down like so many Alexanders to lament a too completely conquered world of mechanical things, just as a time comes to geographers when there are no more regions to explore? Transport, especially by air, may be made less perilous and more convenient. Communication may be extended to include vision; that is half done already, and I confess to no enthusiasm for the other half. Power will certainly be more generally distributed.

"But can we expect the engineers of the coming century to bring about developments in the application of natural resources comparable to those of the past hundred years? I am, as I said, no prophet, but I doubt it. To me it seems more likely that there will be something of a lull in the revolutionary fervor of the engineer. Social changes—drastic social changes—may be looked for, but not, I think, so directly consequent on his activities as in the century now ending.

"It may very well happen that the mental energy of mankind now flowing so strongly in this channel of ours will seek and find outlets in other directions. While as engineers we may regret such an issue, we cannot but admit that it may prove beneficial to the human race,

since beyond question there is grave need for progress of quite a different kind.

"For the fact remains that all our efforts to apply the sources of power in nature to the use and convenience of man, successful as they are in creating for him new capacities, new comforts, new habits, leave him at bottom much what he was before. I used as a young teacher to think that the splendid march of discovery and invention, with its penetration of the secrets of nature, its consciousness of power, its absorbing mental interest, its unlimited possibilities of benefit, was, in fact, accomplishing some betterment of the character of man. I thought that the assiduous study of engineering could not fail to soften his primitive instincts, that it must develop a sense of law and order and righteousness.

"But the war came, and I realized the *moral failure of applied mechanics.* It was a shock to find that a nation's eminence in this department of intellectual effort did nothing to prevent a reversion to savagery, conscienceless, unbridled, made only the more brutal by its vastly enhanced ability to hurt. I saw that the wealth of products and ideas with which the engineer had enriched mankind might be prostituted to ignoble use. It served to equip the nations with engines of destruction incomparably more potent and ruthless than any known before. We had put into the hand of civilization a weapon far deadlier than the weapons of barbarism, and there was nothing to stay her hand.

"Civilization, in fact, turned the weapon upon herself. The arts of the engineer had, indeed, been effectively learnt, but they *had not changed man's soul.* In our diligent cultivation of these arts we engineers have perhaps forgotten that progress in them has far outstripped the ethical progress of the race. We have given the child a sharp-edged tool before he has the sense to handle it wisely. We have given him the power to do irreparable mischief when he hardly knows the difference between right and wrong.

"Does it not follow that the *duty of leadership* is to *educate his judgment* and *his conscience?* Collective moral sense, collective political responsibility, the divine maxim to do to others as we would that they should do to us—these are lessons in respect of which all the nations, even the most progressive, have still much to learn.

"There are people who talk glibly of the next great war. I wonder if they know how near in the last war the world came to destruction through misapplying the endowment which it owes to the engineer. Do they realize that with added experience and further malignant ingenuity the weapons of a future war will be more than ever deadly, more than ever indiscriminate, and the peril to civilization will be indefinitely increased?

"Surely it is for the engineer, as much as any man, to *pray for a spiritual awakening,* to strive after such a growth of sanity as will prevent the gross misuse of his good gifts. For it is the engineer who, in the course of his labors to promote the comfort and convenience of man, has put into man's unchecked and careless hand a monstrous potentiality of ruin."

The Christian Herald's Church Census, 1927

THE REV. H. K. CARROLL, LL.D.

Denominations	Summary in 1927			Gains in 1927		
	Ministers	Churches	Commun'ts	Min.	Chs.	Com.
Adventists (5 bodies)	1,567	2,935	151,862	d3	d84	971
American Rescue Workers	554	170	7,926	29	5	70
Assemblies of God	1,457	1,353	72,143	187	279	10,101
Baptists (14 bodies)	52,133	60,010	8,712,607	d451	d2,093	41,712
Brethren (Dunkards) (4 bodies)	3,304	1,286	162,034	d29	d23	5,266
Brethren (Plymouth) (6 bodies)	....	633	22,961	....	164	9,244
Brethren (River) (3 bodies)	209	114	4,986	43	25	109
Buddhist Oriental Temples	34	12	5,639	....	....	....
Catholic Apostolic	13	13	2,768	....	....	....
Catholics (Eastern) (10 bodies)	696	684	762,425	12	7	8,245
Catholics (Western) (3 bodies)	25,923	18,438	16,854,691	1,211	944	183,889
Christadelphians	....	78	3,980	....	d1	d81
Christian and Missionary Alliance	410	392	25,000	10	16	1,900
Christian Church	1,177	1,157	109,641	160	141	d4,495
Christian Union	390	325	18,200	....	....	....
Church of Christ, Scientist (a)	3,926	1,963	....	d650	d325	....
Church of God, Reformation Movement	1,921	927	34,709	97	250	4,659
Churches of God (Winebrenner)	424	466	28,606	d28	d22	d405
Churches of God and Ss. of Christ (Col.)	200	94	3,311	99	....	....

Denominations	Summary in 1927			Gains in 1927		
	Ministers	Churches	Commun'ts	Min.	Chs.	Com.
Churches of God, General Assembly	300	200	4,628	d623	d466	d16,448
Churches of Living God (Col.)	185	200	5,000	30	....	d1,000
Church of the Nazarene	2,855	1,583	68,612	354	35	4,789
Communists (2 bodies)	....	13	1,577	....	....	d207
Congregationalists (b)	5,510	5,636	914,698	....	....	....
Disciples of Christ (2 bodies)	9,781	14,140	1,799,313	403	d442	44,801
Evangelical Church	1,990	2,184	217,935	13	41	9,764
Evangelistic Associations (13 bodies)	650	272	17,847	206	65	3,914
Evangelical Synod of North America	1,197	1,301	236,118	30	d23	3,451
Free Christian Zion (Col.)	20	35	6,225	....	....	....
Friends (4 bodies)	1,364	913	113,605	d5	d51	d1,847
Jewish Congregations	721	1,901	257,135	....	....	....
Latter-Day Saints (2 bodies)	6,287	1,716	645,158	d4,116	33	8,769
Lutherans (20 bodies)	10,727	15,448	2,656,158	d68	d101	67,879
Mennonites (12 bodies)	1,581	966	97,544	57	d52	7,234
Methodists (16 bodies)	45,598	62,864	9,119,575	1,177	291	150,910
Moravians (2 bodies)	155	172	29,941	d2	....	822
New Jerusalem Churches (2 bodies)	113	96	6,521	10	3	d31
Non-sectarian Bible Faith Churches	119	106	6,281	....	....	....
Pilgrim Holiness	750	441	15,040	32	23	640
Holiness	28	32	861	....	d1	d65
Pentecostal Holiness	282	192	8,096	....	....	2,743

Denominations	Summary in 1927 Ministers	Churches	Commun'ts	Gains in 1927 Min.	Chs.	Com.
Pillar of Fire	14	19	784	....	....	....
Presbyterian (9 bodies)	14,429	15,398	2,597,136	d9	d106	d13,580
Protestant Episcopal	5,830	7,845	1,190,938	37	14	17,259
Reformed (3 bodies)	2,408	2,737	553,641	d13	13	6,617
Reformed Episcopal	70	68	8,622	....	....	....
Salvation Army	4,670	1,704	81,224	56	49	3,535
Scandinavian Evangelical (3 bodies)	606	505	48,590	d20	28	5,332
Schwenkfelders	7	6	1,666	....	....	77
Social Brethren	21	22	1,800	....	....	....
Spiritualists	600	690	75,000	....	....	....
Temple Society	2	2	164	....	....	d96
Unitarians	466	370	62,240	d16	2	3,527
United Brethren (2 bodies)	2,130	3,454	413,818	d95	d50	3,187
Universalists	492	546	48,221	26	d58	d1,573
United Evangelical Church	120	152	21,533	10	....	470
Volunteers of America	512	133	28,756	....	....	1,855
Independent Congregations	267	879	48,673	....	....	....
Grand Total in 1927	217,204	235,991	48,594,163	d1,387	d1,470	573,723

(d) Decrease. (a) The Losses are only apparent, occasioned by inclusion of readers and churches in foreign lands. (b) Statistics are for 1926. Those for 1927 will not be ready until May.

Dr. Bowie Estimates the Anglo-Catholic

Dr. Bowie's article, "Prayer Book, Priests and Protestants," which appeared in the June *Forum* deals so clearly with the Anglo-Catholic attitude toward Reservation and Adoration that *The Chronicle* believes its readers will be glad to have their attention called to its salient points.

Dr. Bowie is discussing the matter of the Revised Book rejected by the House of Commons. But what he says applies with peculiar aptness to the American Anglo-Catholic as well.

The crucial matter, he says justly, upon which the rejection rested is "specifically the permission granted therein for reservation of the sacrament." As is well-known, reservation is at present illegal in the Church of England in spite of the fact that many Bishops tacitly allow it. By the Revised Book reservation is, with the Bishop's consent, permitted.

The English people, as Dr. Bowie points out, believe that "the matter of a more convenient way of administering to the sick is not the real reason why reservation is desired." The Anglo-Catholic wishes it because "it may be the focus for a particular kind of worship."

Certain Anglo-Catholics for example believe that Christ is actually present in the bread and wine and therefore, when reserved, these elements should be adored as Christ Himself.

"At the present time in scores of English parishes the reserved sacrament is actually made the center of worship in the church. Not singular, but typical of a great number of other parishes is the sign in one of the London churches. 'The Blessed Sacrament is perpetually reserved on the north side of the altar; it is hoped that no one will leave the church without an act of homage to the Presence which is in our midst.' "

In this way an idea of the miraculous is injected into our religion which tends to create a belief in the magical power of the priest, and which leads to "authoritarian ideas of the church which also are most completely represented by the Church of Rome." "Philosophically and historically it is true that the religion which magnifies the miraculous as the vehicle of the spirit is likely to shut religion up into shrines and cloisters and corners and leave the mass of mankind unleavened. The Roman Church is the most conspicuous and thorough-going example of the same type of religion which Anglo-Catholics desire." Dr. Bowie correctly states that "the same Anglo-Catholic influences which insist upon the reserved sacrament are definitely bent upon the attempt to accomplish reunion with Rome, even at the price of submission to the headship of the Pope." This is clearly shown by the report of the Malines Conferences.

Under these circumstances it is not hard to understand why the Englishman refused the Revised Book.

The danger attendant upon the Anglo-Catholic movement is that those who participate in it are thoroughly convinced of the justice of their acts and being so convinced can brook no opposition. They con-

ceive it their duty to bring the rest of the Church to their point of view. Their stand is precisely the opposite to tolerance. The Englishman sensed this and the House of Commons rejected the Revised Book "because it intuitively perceived that what the Anglo-Catholics ask for is not tolerance. They seek dominance, to the farthest limits to which their ecclesiastical influence may reach. They wish to control the religious life of The Church of England and stamp it all with their unyielding pattern."

Nor is the American Anglo-Catholic one bit different. With propriety Dr. Bowie quotes from the *American Church Monthly* of June, 1923, "Toleration of Catholic Faith and worship is not our aim. We most firmly believe that Catholicism is the Christian religion—the truth and the whole truth so far as religion is concerned. We know the Catholic Church was founded by God, to be his mouthpiece. Our aim is to convert men to this religion, not just to be allowed peacefully to practice it."

It is against this movement and all it implies that Dr. Bowie properly warns. He recognizes that if we are to preserve our protestantism there is no use of crying peace, when there is no peace. When "The Anglo-Catholics are willing to remember that the Church is meant to be a family of brothers and not a monarchy of undeviating laws; then there can be peace within the Church of England, and within the other communions affiliated with that Church. But until that change comes there is likelihood of much collision."

—*The Chronicle.*

The Folly of a Retreat From Our Protestant Traditions

To the Editor of THE CHRONICLE:

Two evil influences overhang the meeting of our next General Convention; (1) The danger that the extreme Anglo-Catholic Party will so far control the Convention as to strike out the Thirty-Nine Articles from the Prayer Book, and otherwise commit our Church to medievalism and anti-Protestant thought; (2) That the Convention will be blind to the overwhelming and terrible need for a real spiritual awakening of our church and nation, such as shall amount to a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness in a very true sense.

The attention of your readers should be directed to the first of these dangers. The thought that I would impress upon readers of *The Chronicle* is one that is not, perhaps, considered often enough, or seriously enough. It is this: If the extremists succeed in ridding the Church of its Protestant life and character, what position will be left to us that will make us at all useful to the people of this country? What will justify our continued existence as a church? What especial claim can we have upon the thought and life of the American people? Apparently we should have little or no claim upon the attention of earnest and thoughtful men and women. Having rejected the Reformation and that particular form of evangelical truth for which the Reformation stands, we should necessarily leave to our sister protestant

churches all that great and moving appeal which, for example, the Methodist, the Presbyterian, and the Congregational communions, make so successfully to the hearts, consciences and intellects of thousands of persons. I refer to such truths as the following: The immediate communion between God and the human soul, without priestly intervention; the soul's overwhelming need of a personal Redeemer; an open Bible; the right of private judgment and of free inquiry. These things have, in the past, moved mountains of unbelief, and have made men tremble and ask "What shall we do to be saved?" If deprived of the ability to lay these great truths before the world, and to lay them with emphasis, we should be a church without the Spirit of God.

On the other hand, we should make but a lame and sorry figure in an attempt to play the role of a church that glorified in a powerful ecclesiastical organization, with a vast and well-ordered hierarchy, essaying to relieve the individual soul of the settlement of all vexatious and troublesome questions as to life here and salvation hereafter. To the class of minds that like this particular aspect of Christianity, our appeal would be but weak and ineffective. We should be handicapped in seeking to address ourselves to those who hold a faith that is largely unthinking, and we are ready to yield unquestioning obedience. The great Roman communion is a thousandfold more likely to secure the allegiance and enthusiasm of those who place a very high estimate upon the importance of religious organization and priestly authority, and who care little for the right of private judgment, or the doctrine of an inward light and communion between the soul and its Maker. For this class of minds, Rome has the traditions, the experience, and the claim of centuries behind her. Our church would be outgeneraled and outbidden by her at every turn and corner. We should be like David in Saul's armor, wholly unaccustomed to the weapons we were trying to wield.

Consider the whole organization and temper of our church, and one will hardly remain in much doubt. Our Bishops possess only a very moderate degree of control over their clergy; witness the impudent reply of a certain arrogant Anglo-Catholic priest to Bishop Seaman of Texas, who rebuked him for strange and unchurchly practises. Or, again, recall the caution which the Bishop of New York felt obliged to exercise a few year ago, in dealing with a Rector who was thoroughly out of sympathy and out of harmony with the Bishop and a large part of the clergy and laity of the Diocese. Indeed, when a large body of the clergy of any Diocese chance to be in opposition to their Bishop, they can thwart and neutralize his influence to an amazing degree without at any time exposing themselves to ecclesiastical trial or to severe discipline. His power over them is small.

As for our laity, they rest their obedience to, and respect for a Bishop upon the man's character, zeal, learning and unselfish devotion, more than anything else, though without belittling the regularity and sacredness of his orders. They can never be permanently whipped into subjection.

Thus we see that our Church would be likely to "fall between two stools." We should be neither Catholic enough to suit the one class, nor Protestant enough to make our voice heard by those who have long been used to listen to us with respect. With our usefulness thus greatly impaired, it would not be long before the whole organization of our Church would suffer from something very much like a spiritual and moral dry-rot. Like the nobility in France at the time of the great Revolution, our Church would be swept aside as something that no longer had an excuse for cumbering the ground.

May God Almighty spare us from such an unspeakable calamity, and May He make us all realize the truth of those great words, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

William Allmand Robertson.

East Orange, N. J., June 14, 1928. —*The Chronicle.*

"Al Smith for President"

The above is the caption of a very striking editorial from the pen of Mr. Carlton M. Sherwood, Extension Secretary of the International Society of Christian Endeavor. Among other things, Mr. Sherwood says:

"We are going to witness an interesting psychology in the campaign to elect Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, to the presidency of the United States.

"It is nothing new to New Yorkers, but it will be to the nation.

"The Smith forces are going to appeal to the American spirit of fair play and religious tolerance by emphasizing constantly that any opposition whatsoever to Governor Smith is caused by opposition to his Roman Catholic religious faith.

"Their campaign will be clever. It will make its appeal to a large number of citizens who pride themselves on their 'broadmindedness.'

"Thus a cleverly concealed spirit and campaign of religious intolerance will make an appeal to the average American's genuine spirit of religious forbearance.

"For myself, as a Democrat, I shall oppose Governor Smith for nomination or election to the presidency, first because he is a 'wet,' second, because of his Tammany Hall training and associations, and third, because I believe that his ability and achievements in statecraft have been greatly overrated for political purposes. In my judgment, as a political figure aspiring to the presidency, in ability and leadership he is less than ordinary.

"Personally, I shall refuse to allow any group to lead me to support any man because of his religious faith, just as I would refuse to oppose any man for the same reason.

"It is well to oppose religious intolerance wherever one finds it. It is un-American. It is also well to understand on which foot the shoe fits."

In the opinion of the Christian Herald, Mr. Sherwood has made a correct and clear statement of the case. Since his editorial has appeared, Judge Olvany, recognized as the titular leader of Tammany Hall, testifying before the Senate committee investigating primary campaign expenditures, has assured the waiting world that Tammany is in no sense a political organization! And now, little children, stand around and I shall tell you another bedtime story!—*D. A. P., Christian Herald.*

Totengräber der Kirche.

Und wieder ein neuer schmerzlicher Pastorenfall. Diesmal in Ostpreußen, der Fall von Holland, Pfarrer in Grünhagen bei Tapiau. Er hebt sich von den andern, kürzlich berichteten Fällen durch seine Unglaublichkeit ab, unglaublich wegen der völligen Absage eines evangelischen Pfarrers von Bibel und Bekenntnis, sodann wegen einer seltenen Dreistigkeit gegen die vorgesetzte Kirchenbehörde. Der Fall wurde durch die neuen Richtlinien des Konsistoriums in Königsberg für den Konfirmandenunterricht veranlaßt, die Pfarrer Holland in nachfolgendem Schreiben (abgedruckt mit sichtlicher Genugtuung in der „Lehrerzeitung für Ost- und Westpreußen" vom 27. April 1928) zurückwies, Datum: 23. Februar 1928:

„Dem Evangelischen Konsistorium zu Königsberg, Pr.

erkläre ich hierdurch, daß ich mich weigere, die Richtlinien für den Konfirmandenunterricht anzunehmen, welche die Verfügung Nr. 7178 des Kirchlichen Amtsblatts enthält:

Es ist geradezu ein Verbrechen an der deutschen Seele und an dem gotterschaffenen Geist unsers deutschen Volks, wenn der Lehrgang des Kirchlichen Unterrichts durch den Lutherschen Katechismus bestimmt wird, der vor 400 (vierhundert!) Jahren für die Zeit vor 400 Jahren und dazu noch als Notbehelf von Luther verfaßt wurde. In damaliger Zeit mag der Katechismus seinen Zweck erfüllt haben, für die deutsche Seele der Gegenwart ist er einfach ungenießbar.

Im Einverständnis mit vielen aufrechten, treu gesinnten und denkenden deutschen Männern und Frauen erkläre ich, daß ich zu keiner Zeit meines Lebens durch Sätze des Lutherschen Katechismus erhoben, gestärkt, beseligt, geläutert worden bin, sondern durch das Kennenlernen des großen Reichtums, den uns Gott durch unsre deutsche Natur, durch unsre deutsche Dichtung, Kunst und Weisheit und durch all dies unsäglich herrliche unerschöpfbare deutsche Geistes- und Herzensgut verliehen hat. —

Es ist die Pflicht einer deutschen Kirche, sich auf dies deutsche Geistes- und Herzensgut, als Ganzes gesehen, zu gründen und nicht ein einzelnes der Vergangenheit angehörendes Zeugnis und Bekenntnis, wie es der Lutherische Katechismus darstellt, zur Richtschnur zu nehmen. Das wäre das ärgste Mißverstehen des kühnen, seiner Zeit in vielem weit vorauseilenden Luthergeistes, der auf keinen Fall durch seinen Katechismus das religiöse Leben der kommenden Jahrhunderte am Gängelband führen wollte. —

Um in Luthers Sinn zu handeln, müssen wir über Luther hinausschreiten. Das gilt auch in bezug auf unsre Stellung zu den biblischen Schriften.

Für Luther waren die biblischen Schriften damals ein unendlich wertvolles Stärkungs- und Kampfmittel. Sein glühendes Herz und sein kühner Geist legten freilich in die Aussagen der biblischen Schriftsteller oft mehr hinein, als darin enthalten ist.

Für uns Deutsche des 20. Jahrhunderts können die biblischen Schriften nicht mehr die Bedeutung haben, welche sie für Luther hatten. In dem vorhin erwähnten großen deutschen Herzens-, Geistes- und Naturgut, als Ganzes gesehen, hat uns Gott eine weit herrlichere, tiefere, uns gemäßere Offenbarung gegeben, als sie die Bibel uns zu vermitteln vermag. Weder die Sätze der Bergpredigt, noch die Erörterungen des Paulus in seinen Briefen an Römer, Korinther usw., geschweige denn die Werke des Moses, Ezechiel, Salomo, Judas usw. vermögen die deutsche Seele so im Innersten zu ergreifen, zu beseligen, zu läutern, zu trösten und zu erheben, wie das aus deutschem Geist heraus geborene Worte und Weisen vermögen. Unser Volk, soweit es gesund ist, greift nicht zu Lukas, Paulus und Moses, sondern zu **Paul Gerhardt, Claudius** und, soweit dies wieder erweckt wird, zum **deutschen Volkslied** und zum tiefsinnigen **deutschen Märchen.** Auch ist der „gemeine Mann" und vor allem seine Kinder für die Schätze unsrer großen **klassischen Dichtung** und überhaupt für das gewaltige deutsche Geistes-, Herzens- und Naturgut weit aufgeschlossener als die meisten unsrer „Gebildeten", wie ich aus nunmehr 14 Amtsjahren weiß, die ich in Stadt und Land zugebracht, vielmehr denkend, fühlend und mich weiter entwickelnd durchlebt habe. —

Diejenigen Kreise unsers Volks, welche sich einseitig auf die Bibel gründen, sind durchweg als ungesund zu bezeichnen. Die Bibel mag in mancher Hinsicht **eine** der Wurzeln des deutschen Geistesbaums sein, doch Baumwurzeln läßt man ruhen und erfreut sich und stärkt sich an den herrlichen Früchten des deutschen Geistesbaums.

Eine deutsche Kirche hat daher **nicht** die Aufgabe, dem deutschen Volk heute Bibelsätze zu predigen, sondern deutsches edelstes Geistes- und Herzensgut zu vermitteln. Die besten unsrer Choräle werden da ihren Ehrenplatz immer behaupten, neue werden geschaffen werden.

Statt der bisher üblichen biblischen Schriftverlesungen bringe ich längst Worte deutscher Geister, z. B. von Luther, Schleiermacher, Kant, Fichte, Arndt usw. Ueberhaupt suche ich jeden Gottesdienst dem Gedächtnis eines deutschen großen Geistes zu weihen. So habe ich Walter Flex, Eichendorff, Schenkendorff, Schleiermacher, Arndt, Kant, Lessing u. a. gefeiert und werde auf diesem Weg fortschreiten, unbeirrt dadurch, daß ein Teil der Gemeinde dies Bestreben ablehnt. Die gesunden Geister unter Alten und Jungen werden sich immer mehr anschließen und es wird ihr Schade nicht sein.

Auch meinen Konfirmandenunterricht sowie die Arbeit in unsrer Jugendgruppe habe ich ganz nach den oben gezeichneten Ueberzeugungen aufgebaut und tue damit an der deutschen Seele einen besseren Dienst, als wenn ich mit Katechismus und Bibel daherkäme. — So handle ich nach meinem Gewissen und bin von dem Sieg meiner Richtung überzeugt. Hierdurch habe ich meine Ablehnung der behördlicherseits gegebenen Richtlinien für den Konfirmandenunterricht genügend begründet. —

Die Verlängerung des kirchlichen Unterrichts um ein Jahr halte ich

für unsre Verhältnisse für unnötig, ja für kaum durchführbar; denn ein großer Teil der Kinder der hiesigen großen Gemeinde hat weite Wege bis zum Kirchort zurückzulegen. Die Kinder noch außer dem Schulunterricht an freien Nachmittagen zum Konfirmandenunterricht zu bestellen, halte ich für eine zwecklose Ueberlastung der jugendlichen Körper und Geister. Die (in der Verfügung des kirchlichen Amtsblatts genannten) „christlichen ernsten Eltern," welche von einer Verdoppelung der kirchlichen Unterrichtszeit so viel erwarten, betrachte ich mit Mißtrauen: wenn sie solche Erwartungen hegen, sind sie mehr töricht und trübselig als ernst und nachdenkend. Auch habe ich oft hinter derartigen „frommen" Wünschen weiter nichts als Heuchelei und Wichtigtuerei gefunden. —

Bezüglich der im Kirchlichen Amtsblatt Nr. 7193 „Häusliche Feier der Einsegnung" gegebenen Anweisung, durch Verbreitung des mit Worten sehr hochgreifenden Flugblatts „An die Eltern unsrer Konfirmanden" oder durch ähnliche Ermahnungen für bessere Begehung des Einsegnungstags zu wirken, bemerke ich, daß solche Ermahnungen nichts fruchten können, so lange die Pfarrer nicht mit eigenem Beispiel vorangehen und auf jeden Alkoholgenuß verzichten. Das wird nur möglich sein bei gleichzeitiger Enthaltung von Tabak u. dgl. Reizmitteln, wozu im großen und ganzen auch das Fleisch gehört.

Die in den Deutschen Wandervogel-Bünden zusammengefaßte Jugend hat schon seit Jahrzehnten um des Vaterlands willen auf jeglichen Alkohol, Tabak, ja, zum Teil auch auf Fleischgenuß verzichtet und wirkt durch ihr Beispiel ohne tönende biblische Worte weit erhebender als die den wirklichen Volksschäden wortreich und machtlos gegenüberstehende Kirche. Ich selbst bin durch das wortlose Beispiel junger Wandervögel völlig frei von Alkohol, Tabank und Tierfleisch geworden und habe durch Vereinfachung meiner Lebensweise immer mehr Kräfte für bessere Dinge frei bekommen. —

Von der Art des „Wandervogels" könnte die Kirche überhaupt viel lernen, statt immer in die Bahnen ungesunden „Gemeinschafts-Christentums" zu geraten, welches nur Heuchler und Frömmler, aber nicht aufrechte, treue, deutsche Menschenkinder groß zieht.

Rudolf Holland, Pfarrer."

Also ein evangelischer Pfarrer, der den Katechismus seiner Kirche feierlich verwirft und im Gottesdienst die Bibel nicht mehr verliest, dem die Bibel eine abgestandene „Wurzel" ist, die man „ruhen läßt." Es ist ja für Ostpreußen keine Ueberraschung, was Pf. Holland schreibt. Seit länger als 10 Jahren ist er durch seine Eigenartigkeiten bekannt und hat die Geduld des Konsistoriums auf die Probe gestellt. Dieser neue Vorstoß scheint endlich die Geduld erschöpft zu haben; wie man hört, ist er zunächst beurlaubt, und man erwartet seine endgültige Ausscheidung aus dem Kirchendienst. In der Tat dürfte ein Mann mit solchen Anschauungen in der Kirche nichts mehr zu tun haben. („Allg. Luth. Kchztg.")

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

Those Disturbing Miracles, by *Lloyd C. Douglas.* Harper and Brothers, publishers, New York. 1927. 260 pages.

L. C. Douglas, the pastor of First Congregational Church of Los Angeles, has lately (in the "Christian Century") explained to us the reason of the "Seeming Impotence of Christianity." Christianity is unable to influence the general character and conduct of the people because it wastes time on metaphysical speculations (the Trinity, nature and origin of Jesus, probably) and is burdened with an outworn atonement theory based on the sacrificial system of Judaism ("the churches have always seemed at their best when conducting a funeral over the mangled remains of their crucified Christ"). If they would rather learn from Jesus, who lived entirely *unafraid of God*, the right conception of the deity, the kinetic energies would be released to enable them to serve the public as power-houses for the transmission of a tremendous moral energy. If they, however, prefer the mere sentimentalities of mysticism, the world will soon look for other agencies for making real and practical the power of God to motivate the soul.

These views, although not at all original, may prepare us for the rather radical treatment of the subject Mr. Douglas discusses in this book. He sets out by saying that all great facts have come to us through a process of gradual relief from superstition. Astronomy has evolved from astrology, chemistry from alchemy; and because we have arrived at the well authenticated facts of science it behooves us by no means to look down with contempt on the guesses of a prescientific age. The same law applies to religion, to our own religion as well as to all religion. The Bible is the record of the spiritual evolution of a great race. No one who is acquainted with the facts and not hampered by an untenable view of inspiration, will deny that the God-consciousness of the Old Testament writers shows a gradual rise from the lower to the higher. The "Jovian caprice and Jehovistic impetuosity of the God of the early seers are in time eliminated in the interest of a steady and law-loving God." The ancient Jehovah religion was "evolved by shepherds, socially restricted, economically enslaved, and enisled against the broadening contacts with the outside world." When environments and conditions changed and widened, ideas would naturally follow. Even the New Testament does not bring us to the end of the process. The apostle Paul believed in the speedy end of the world. No wonder he was not interested in the art and philosophy of Greece or in the betterment of institutions of his age. To think that the leaders of Israel or the Church were the interpreters of the infallible oracles

of the deity, is to have a wrong view of revelation. God revealed himself not only then and there, he reveals himself to us the same as to them. The honest seeker always finds him. It seems that in our scientific age God's dealings with men will be determined by the test tube and the blow pipe rather than by the surplice and chalice. "The Bunsen burner will in the future be as potent as the censer in the past." Humanity will free itself from physical inhibitions and mental adhesions by the use of all kinds of scientific methods.

To us moderns, believing as we do in the continuity of natural law, the miraculous element in the Bible proves a stumbling block. We know that miracles, miracles in the ordinary sense of the word, don't happen today, and cannot see how they could have happened then. God is the same and nature is the same, why, then, should divine action have been different in Bible times than it is now? And even granting that the Bible miracles were genuine, what benefit would they be to us when we are sure we can't count on them at this time? The author is chiefly interested in the miracles of Jesus, but he discusses some found in the Old Testament. He himself does not believe in miracles. He says, "the history of the Hebrew race is draped in the graceful folds of the mantle of legend." To him, therefore, the miracles recorded are natural events which have been "embellished by the minstrel." The poets of the nation are the creators of these beautiful myths, even as Homer idealized for the Greeks their past and the lives of their fabulous heroes.

Nevertheless, he is by no means minded to relegate the whole religious contribution of the Hebrews to a subordinate place. The conception of deity among the Hebrews, he says, so early, is so far in advance of the ideas of the time that it is a great problem to account for it on any ordinary principle.

Coming to the miracles predicated of or about Jesus, the writer sees in the miracle stories everywhere the embellished activity of poetic fancy, spoken of above. He dissolves them all into allegories, pictorial representations of moral or spiritual ideas. The infancy stories, e. g., have only impressional, no historical value; that is, they give the impression of the writer in poetic, dramatic form. One might say, with Ritschl, they express judgments of value, not of fact; they have revelation worth, not scientific. Did the angels ever sing in Bethlehem's fields? No, they sang only in the hearts of the believers. To the believers it was the same as though they had actually sung.

In explaining the story of the temptations of Jesus, he says, the first one is the decisive one. Jesus made the test whether the real man is his soul or his body; whether the man as a soul, a son of God, would command the body, was in command of his life. Jesus came through this test victorious, with the exultant faith that now, having won in the battle, he could do everything; that he was "the master of his soul and the captain of his fate." His gospel is henceforth that man, living by the spiritual energies communicated by the omnipotent God, has the source of happiness and power in contact with the father. In the miracle of Cana, the first one according to John, the evangelist

wrote a poem. It contains the lesson of the transforming presence of Jesus. With Jésus there, it was as if the water they drank was wine. The stilling of the storm is the dramatic telling of the fact that nothing can ever upset the equilibrium in the disciples' minds. What would be the use, he asks, of Jesus stilling the storm once, at that particular time? He doesn't do it now. He saves men *in* storms, not *from* them. He is no magician, to astound and mystify. The feeding of the 5000 is no miracle of multiplying. Jesus took the boy's loaves and thanked God for his blessings and for the willingness to share them with others, and his example and spirit evoked the same willingness in the multitude. They produced what they had brought, shared it with those who had not, and everyone had a plentiful meal. In the healing of the blind, again, we have that same pictorial form of telling a spiritual truth, that Jesus is the light of the world. The resurrection of Jesus does not imply the revivifying of his dead body, but that his spirit, his gospel and his influence continue.

We do not believe that this attempt to make the miracles of Jesus less disturbing will convince anybody. It is the same method that the Rationalists employed 150 years ago; the same path followed by Strauss, Paulus (Heidelberg), and a host of others, later. It is undertaken on the assumption that miracles do not and cannot happen. But be that as it may, no candid reader of the gospels will get the impression that the gospel writers themselves did not hand these stories down as miracles. If, e. g., the feeding of the 5000 was nothing but what Mr. Douglas says, why, then, was the excitement aroused so great that they wanted to make him king, as John says? Why was the story told by all four gospel writers if it contained nothing but a manifestation of the good-heartedness dormant in human nature?

And as for the "embellishment of the minstrels" which the author detects everywhere, some of the gospels were written about 30 years after Jesus' death. At that time the minstrels had had no time to spin there fantastic tales. There were eye-witnesses enough, and honest men enough, to contradict any attempt to falsify the record of Jesus' life.

Finally, if miracles don't happen in the physical sphere, how can we account for the moral and spiritual miracle of Christ's person and message? The one denial leads of necessity to the denial of the other. To the author Jesus is the man who, having won a spiritual conflict in his own soul, teaches others to do the same. He is the interpreter of the Christian way of living, which embraces the two principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But that, although implied in his message, was not his gospel. His gospel was that salvation from sin comes to mankind in his death and resurrection. The Christian religion was essentially a Saviour-religion. With that the apostles went out, on that the church was founded, and with it they conquered the world. This gospel the author repudiates. His non-miraculous position makes him unfit to be an expounder of the miracles of Jesus, and still more to grasp the meaning of his lifework and person.

If one believes in Christ as the bringer of salvation to the race, he has no difficulty in believing that such a man could do miracles. The authority of his person is to him the guarantee of the genuineness of his works.

It is true miracles of that sort don't happen now; and that, therefore, in preaching about his miracles we have to employ largely the symbolical method in the application. But in doing this, we do not dissolve the miracles themselves in parabolical poems. They are to us a manifestation of the divine sympathy of the master and his power over sin, disease, death, nature, which power he puts at the disposal of the believer when he sees himself face to face with the evils of life.

Transition. A Sentimental Story of One Mind and One Era, by *Will Durant*. Simon and Schuster, New York. 1927. 352 pages.

The author of the *Story of Philosophy* here shows the "effect, upon one growing mind, of the profound transformation which modern science and research have brought in the faith of the western world." The story seems wholly autobiographical. He calls his hero John Lemaire, but John is doubtless Will Durant himself. Of course, we don't know how far he has, with poetic license, embellished the story in detail, but the essential features delineate his own experience. The "Transition" which the author describes is the passing of the son of a devout Catholic family from faith to skepticism. He becomes acquainted with modern critical science and turns his back upon the dogmas of an authoritative church.

He calls it a "sentimental" story for his breaking away from mother church entailed much suffering upon his parents and, incidentally, upon himself.

John Lemaire was the son of French-Canadian parents. Endowed with unusual gifts, he had been induced by the priest and his own pious parents to study for the priesthood. Being himself without any pronounced religious bent, this step was bound to have disastrous consequences. While in the academy already, he had secretly read many books considered dangerous for the loyal Catholic. But when he became acquainted with Darwin the bottom dropped out of the slender faith he still had. He felt that it was hypocrisy for him to enter the seminary, but the fear to break his mother's heart prevailed with him. The two years in the seminary were naturally years of bondage, he realized he was living a lie. At last he summoned enough energy to cut the knot. He fell in with a group of anarchists and one evening, in a mood of bravado, gave a lecture in which he claimed that religion originated in sex worship. When the bishop of the diocese heard of it he excommunicated him, and this action was published in the newspapers. His father and mother were heartbroken. The chapter in which the author describes the devastating effect the bishop's step had on the mind of the devout and loving mother, is the most touching in the whole book.

His father turned him out of the house. His existence was for a time of a very precarious nature until a benefactor, Mr. Alden (the Mr.

Alden Freeman whom Durant mentions in the preface to "the Story of Philosophy"), whom he had met in his connection with the "Radicals," gave him the means for travel in Europe and, later, to study four years in Columbia University. Soon after his return he fell in love with a 14 year-old girl, born in a Russian Ghetto, who had just immigrated to America. He married her a few months later and she not only became his beloved wife but also the companion of his studies.

The World War breaks out and he comes under the influence of Mr. Wilson and his ideals, for a while, but with the peace disillusionment begins and he sees, as never before, that the world cannot be bettered by violence and slaughter.

He had for a long time, politically, been a pupil of Marx; the Socialists seemed to be the only party that had a thoroughgoing scheme for the economic salvation of the world. Still he noticed that even Socialists when becoming prosperous, left the cause of Labor and joined the propertied class. What was the use to run after utopias? Was it not better to be satisfied with what was possible than to demand the whole loaf? He decided to throw in his lot with the Liberals, the open-minded, the practical politicians, the believers (and beneficiaries) of Science.

We see John Lemaire, or W. Durant, holds his faiths lightly, they are no life and death matters to him. He is no crusader; he does not stick to his ideals through thick and thin. Defeat discourages him, it makes him sad and skeptical but he has no desire to reach for the martyr's crown. When a child is born to him and he feels the joys of parenthood, hope begins to revive in him. The family, he argues, is after all closer to us than the state. The race will live even if the individual dies; our children will carry on the work of the fathers, we shall live in them. It is a beautiful chapter in which he describes the birth of his child and the effect it had on his dampened spirit. But it seems rather a small consolation for a man who has lost his faith in God and in society, to say, "have I not a beloved child in my arms?" The child later brings about a reconciliation with the old parents.

It is an interesting book. The author has a wonderfully facile pen, he seems to write with astonishing ease. One thing we don't like about the book is the gratuitous frankness of his love stories. He has quite a few of them and tells us exactly how far he, or they, went, as though he had taken J. J. Rousseau for his pattern. Does he want us to know what a devil of a fellow he was? He certainly tells them with keen relish.

He had left the Catholic church and the priesthood but he speaks many a good word for the priests. With few exceptions they are all pure because the sexual instinct was suppressed in them through the severe discipline of the seminary; and they are nearly all sincere believers because in the formative years of their life faith was so systematically ingrained in them that it became a habit. The author's own example does not seem to support these conclusions, but then with him skepticism and sex offered too much of a resistance to the methods of the seminary. Will Durant, in his "transition," lost his church and

faith and exchanged science for it. His gifts enabled him to achieve comparative wealth and considerable fame, in addition to his domestic happiness. With these things in his possession, he finds that the sun shines on his path again. Still, wealth and fame alone won't satisfy very long, and our children may die before us or may disappoint us. Therefore happiness built on these factors is insecure. It seems the part of wisdom then to build on a more stable foundation, and where is there one unless it be in some "cosmic" support?

Religious Thought in the Last Quarter Century, by *J. M. Powis Smith, Shirley Jackson Case, Harold R. Willoughby, John Thomas McNeill, Gerald Birney Smith, Edward L. Schaub, A. Eustace Hayden, Theodore G. Soares, Ozora S. Davis, Archibald G. Baker,* and *Shailer Mathews.* Edited by *G. B. Smith.* The University of Chicago Press, 1927. 239 pages.

This book containing articles by eleven writers which appeared first in the "Journal of Religion" (in 1926) surveys the progress of theological scholarship during the quarter-century just ended.

The first article is on *Old Testament Interpretation,* by *J. M. Powis Smith.* The history of Old Testament Criticism is briefly told, especially that of the Pentateuch. The critical study of the Old Testament will in the future be less concerned with the text or with the age and the relations of the various documents. The approach to the writers will be from the psychological viewpoint. The student will try to understand them and their message from the time and circumstances in which they lived. In the same way, the religion of the Hebrews in general will not be considered as a mere product of divine revelation. It will be studied in connection with the religions of other peoples which influenced Hebrew history. The Canaanites, the Assyrians, Babylonians and, particularly, Egypt, have all in turn played a vital part in the shaping of Israel's fate and have been essential factors in its religious development. As Israel's geographical horizon widened, so did its faith. In many respects the Jews have also borrowed from other nations, but it must be admitted that whatever they borrowed they enriched and refined.

The *Life of Jesus* is treated by *Shirley Jackson Case.* In the past the life of Jesus used to be studied with the principal motive of edification. Jesus was to be presented as the fitting object of adoration. Or, if more scholarly work was done, there was always an apologetic purpose in the mind of the writer. Certain doctrines, such as the trinity, the two natures of Christ, the miracles, etc., were to be defended, and it had to be shown that they were in the record and that the record was reliable. Again, personal bias played its part. Whatever interest was paramount in the mind of the biographers he projected into the life of Jesus. Jesus was the social reformer, the pacifist, the Y. M. C. A. worker, the typical modern hustler. (Bruce Barton.)

According to Case the person and life of Jesus must be studied impartially, with no preconceived ideas. The student ought to divest himself of all dogmatic prejudice. He ought to see him as a son of his

time; he ought to study the Jewish sources and learn to understand the sociological environment in which Jesus grew up and lived. Only so can he come close to the facts.

Case has done this himself in his "New Biography of Jesus." With what disastrous consequences, we have tried to show in the B. R. of the March number, p. 150 ff.

After a "Study of Early Christianity" by Willoughby and an "Interpretation of Protestantism" by McNeill, the editor himself writes on *Theological Thinking in America.*

Theology has for centuries professed truths which are divinely authorized. The source of that authority has been located in the Bible. Modern scholarship has shown that the Bible cannot be used as such a court of last appeal. Some of the doctrines of the Christian creed arose later than the Bible, for instance the metaphysical conception of the Trinity. Some are denied by the new science, such as the creation of man, the fall of Adam and its consequences; some are in contradiction to the nature of God as revealed by Christ, such as the doctrine of hell and everlasting punishment.

Modern scholarship, therefore, is learning to be less concerned about the Bible as such. Miracles are a stumbling block to the modern theologian. He recognizes a large admixture of legend all through the biblical record. Instead of using the Bible text as authoritative, as it stands, he rather bases his claims on spiritual experience. What cannot be thus experienced is of no value to the man of today. With this criterion in application, angels, eschatology, the Trinity, the two natures, the doctrine of sin and salvation, the Christologies cease to be of present interest, they reflect the religious notions of past ages.

Modern science is building up a culture that does not need the support of religion. Our very conception of the Deity may have to be revised as a result of the scientific study of the world and of history. We are not in a position to give more than a tentative formulation as yet, but the contributions from science to this all-important subject may be far-reaching.

Mr. Smith has followed a similar line of reasoning in his "Current Christian Thinking." See our discussion of it in B. R., July number, p. 318.

That by giving up the Bible as a source of authority Protestantism would give up itself goes without saying. The abandoning of the verbal inspiration of the Bible by no means robs it of its supreme position. It may not be so easy to show how far the authority of the Bible goes in detail, but Christ's revelation of God the father and of salvation in him and him only, are irreducible elements. There are chapters on the Psychology of Religion in the book; on History of Religions; Religious Education; American Preaching; Foreign Missions; and Social Christianity. The position of the writers is that of the Liberal school and perhaps mostly the left wing of that school. Still they are all able contributions, covering the field with reasonable fulness. It is a book not only good to read but also to have. The bibliography given on each subject is a valuable feature.

For reference purposes the book fills a useful place.

Preaching Values in New Translations of the New Testament, by *Halford E. Luccock*. The Abingdon Press, 1928. 312 pages. $2.00.

This volume contains the "high spots" of the three modern translations of the New Testament, those by Moffatt, Weymouth and Goodspeed. "It presents more than 150 of the most striking and arresting texts which bring new ideas and fresh insights not found in the more familiar words of the King James and Revised Versions. With each text there are a few paragraphs of brief, pointed, incisive comment, showing how these new and vivid renderings of the words of the New Testament may be put to the service of winning an eager hearing for New Testament truth. Original, fertile in inventions, stimulating to the imagination, these chapters will provide suggestive starting points for fresh thinking."

To give a few illustrations Matt. 11: 6 is translated by Goodspeed: "Blessed is the man who finds nothing that *repels* him in me." This furnishes the title, "The Repellent Christ," and it is pointed out that today many are repelled by him on account of: 1) the spirit of acquisition so dominant a force in life, 2) the modern love of comfort, 3) the moral austerity in Christ, 4) self-assertive nationalism. Or, Luke 7: 30: "The . . . *experts* in the law thwarted God's purpose for themselves." (Goodspeed.) Here the mistakes of the different experts may be shown up: the psychological expert (J. Watson: "the soul is a relic of an outworn psychology"); the anthropological expert ("the Nordic races are superior to all others"); the military expert, etc. Emerson Fosdick had a review of the book in a recent number of the "Christian Century." It was entitled "Priming the Preacher's Pump." A very apt metaphor, for, indeed, if the preacher is out for fresh subjects or for such comment as will start his mental processes into new activity, he finds here the kind that for suggestiveness is hard to surpass.

Does Civilization Need Religion? By *Reinhold Niebuhr*. The Macmillan Company, 1928. $2.00.

We have seen two very favorable, although brief reviews of this first venture of our fellow-Synodical, one in "The Christian Century" and one in the "Federal Council Bulletin." During this year's "Pastors' Convention" at Columbus, just over, it occupied a prominent place on the book stand, sold like the proverbial hot cakes, and was a source of pride to the members of the Synod, especially the younger set.

We regret that we are not able to discuss it in this issue. We anticipate great profit and enjoyment from its study and shall review it (s. c. J.) in the May Number (see p. 234, ff).

Rough-Hewed and Other Sermons, by *Raymond L. Forman*. The Abingdon Press. 1927. 211 pages, $1.50. Eighteen sermons by the pastor of St. Paul's Methodist Church, of New York City. There is in them "full evidence of intellectual vigor, scholarly instinct, spiritual discernment, and moral earnestness."

Parenthood and the Character Training of Children, by *Thomas Walton Galloway, Ph.D.*, Associate Director Department of Educational Measures, American Social Hygiene Association. The Methodist Book Concern, 1927. 224 pages, $1.00.

"This book is designed to introduce parents to the task of building up sound character and conduct, and to help them to pass on to their children the best they know and feel. It undertakes to help anxious parents to see their duty clearly and to perform it without embarrassment and with intelligence."

Light for the Dark Hours of Life, published once a month by the Association for City Missions of the Evangelical Churches of St. Louis. Thirty cents per year; 100 copies or more 20c each per year.

The four-page pamphlet contains a prayer, Scripture passage, song and comment, all selected with a view to console the sick and afflicted. Can be used with profit in hospitals; the patients enjoy it.

God, the Great Poet, Man, the Great Poem, by *Bruce S. Wright.* The Abingdon Press, 1928. 196 pages, $1.25.

Paul says in Ephesians 2, 10: We are his workmanship, poiema. Because poiema (work, product of work) gradually came to mean "poem" also, the author conceived the idea that man is, in a real sense, a poem, God's poem. He finds himself in accord with Longfellow who says:

"For what are all our contrivings,
And the wisdom of our books,
When compared with your caresses
And the gladness of your looks?
"Ye are better than all the ballads
That ever were sung or said;
For ye are *living poems*,
And all the rest are dead."

This thought of man's being God's poem holds all the sermons of the book together. The writer carries it out like this: "The Trend of the Poem" (speaking of Hopeful Tendencies in Present Day Religion); "The Poem Marches" (Progress pictured in the world); "The Poem has Polish" (Adornment of the Doctrine); "The Poem's Rhythm" (I Love a River); "Poems Young and Old" (The A. C. D. of Youth and Age); "The Poem's Chimax" (Praise, Peace and a Program) etc. The sermons are helpful, practical and interesting. The underlying idea, however, seems to us too fanciful, too artificial to carry the weight attached to it. Man is without a doubt the product of the creative spirit; but he is only in a very limited sense a poem, and the author undertook too much when he tried to develop that one theme in 18 variations.